

VINDICATION
OF THE
Doctrine of Justification
AND
Union before Faith.

Wherein the great Truth of the Grace of our Lord Jesus, in his representing the Person of his Elect on the Cross, or his suffering for them, as their Representative, is Asserted and Cleared.

And the Eternal Justification and Union of the Lord's chosen People, is plainly Stated and Proved.

Also the Assurance of Faith is evidently Confirmed.

With a Clear Demonstration how these precious Gospel Truths do promote Holiness and Sanctification in the Hearts and Conversations of true Believers.

By R. Davis, Pastor of the Church at Rowel.

Printed for William Marshal, and Sold by him at the Bible in Newgate-Street. And by John Marshal at the Bible in Grace-Church-Street, MDCXCVIII.



S the
cating
tion
was man
begotten
Grace
by the C
by the E
gh the co
of Light
d implac
of his inv
Principles
mistaken
against it
gross Ab
with P
er of God
who are
son of wh
the choi
most other
man's I
ted, when
arable an
acer by
is eviden
aren; wh
le of his
oves that
his Prefa
tes some
essions w
be wou
fre Lar
nd Culy
against t
have b
equal in
borridly
beginning
d to all t
succession

To the READER.

If there is nothing of greater importance, than those great Truths of the Eternal Justification and Union of the Elect, by and with the Lord Jesus; as it hath its Foundation and Being in the Everlasting Sovereign good Pleasure of the Holy God; and was managed in that Eternal Covenant, or Counsel of Peace between the Father and his begotten Son; whose goings forth were of Old, and from Everlasting; wherein the wonderful Grace of our God doth so marvellously appear to the Praise of his Glorious Name. And whereby the Comfort of our Souls is established; and through which we are powerfully influenced by the Efficacy of the Spirit of Christ unto Purity and Holiness; and engaged and enabled by the constraining Power of Divine Love, therein shining, to yield according to the measure of Light and Assistance, afforded universal and sincere Obedience. So it is that which our implacable Enemy of our Salvation, endeavours by all his Policy, Craft, and Subtlety, by his inveterate Malice, either to deny or pervert, either by fomenting of such false erroneous Principles, as may draw Souls off from believing its sacred Verity. Or by obscuring it by mistaken Notions as may darken the Evidence of it. Or lastly, by raising up Prejudices against it, partly by some strange Consequences as shall be unjustly drawn from it, or seem gross Absurdities, that by a misrepresenting of it shall be cast upon it, as if it were inconsistent with Piety and Purity. And lastly, by calumniating or reproaching those that by the power of God are in a measure enabled to own it, and declare it. Whereby, well meaning Persons, who are inquiring after Truth may stumble at it, or be offended with it. Unto the Promotion of which he doth not want instruments, even amongst those who would be reckoned among the chiefest of them, who profess and Preach the Gospel. An Example whereof we have amongst others, in him, who is the Author and Publisher of the Preface or Introduction to Mr. Man's Narrative against the Church Assembling at Kilby, at whose Instigation it was made, whereby that Breach which otherwise was likely in time to be healed, is thereby made irreparable and incurable. That Church being thereby necessitated to Publish an Answer to it. That Breach by that, and several such evil Practises, that may rather be lamented, than rehearsed, is evidently thereby manifested to be such a one, that soweth or promoteth Discord among Brethren; which is one of the Things, which our God bates, Prov. 6. 16, 19. Who by the use of his Conversation in too many Instances, seems to some to be evidently such a one as deserves that Character, 2 Tim. 3. 5. For which the Lord give him true Repentance. This Prefacer to give vent to that causeless, if not malicious Envy that was in his Heart; and some exorbitant and very offensive Expressions of one David Culy: Although those Expressions were detected and openly testified against by the worthy Author of this Treatise, he would insinuate; as if he were the Favourer or the Abettor of him in uttering that offensive Language; or as if it were to be deduced from his Doctrine. Yea, though the said David Culy, hath openly retracted or repented of those Exorbitancies, should any take an occasion against that Prefacer to Report and Publish the several Exorbitant Words and Practises, which have been spoken or done by him; he might peradventure be found but little inferior, if equal in some respect to David Culy. But what can be expected from him, who could so horribly, falsely, accuse in Print those Churches as to their Principles and Practise in their beginning, with that which they professed the contrary unto in their Profession of Faith, published to all the World; even those very Churches, to whom he himself doth own himself related in Succession: Had his Repentance been right, he would have owned his Shame in every printed

Book that he hath publish'd since to the World, with his Iniquity in drawing in (so many meaning Persons to recommend his Book) without due Examination. They certainly not supposing they had to do with a Person that was so false and daring; in like manner for him to flie upon, and to nibble at the sound Positions of those famous Worthies, Dr. Twiss and Mr. Eyre's, &c. about the Eternal Justification of the Elect, which they have proved by weighty Arguments, without answering of those Arguments, was such a Presumption, that none so seriously enquire after Truth would have dared to be found guilty of.

But it pleaseth our most gracious God and Saviour to bring Good out of Evil, to make that which was done for the hindrance of Truth, to be for the furtherance of it; by the occasion that is thereby taken through the Assistance of the Holy Spirit, to confirm that Truth that Contradicted and reproached.

Whereof we have an Instance in the ensuing Treatise, whereby, and on the occasion of the Gainsaying and Reproaching of the Prefacer, we have those precious Truths of our dear Lord Jesus mentioned in the Title Page, plainly declared, and solidly confirmed, and with meanness, vindicated with successful evidence from the Opposition made by that quarrelsome and contentious Prefacer. So that if he for time to come, shall go on to caluminate or cavil at the great Gospel Truths; it will certainly shew him to have a Conscience scared, as with an Iron.

We wish indeed some Words in the Treatise, had been uttered in a plainer Dialect or Language for the understanding of the meanest. However we do not Question, but the unlearned may receive Information and Instruction by it as well as others.

Therefore, that the Pious Worthy Author, may be more abundantly inlightned, and confirmed in these glorious Truths of the Grace of the Gospel. That with all boldness he may be enabled to declare them. And that he may be instructed into the right Way of all the Institutions our Lord and Saviour; that he make not use of a Stone of Babylon, for a Corner, or for Foundation in any respect.

And that this Treatise of his, may be Blessed unto the Benefit and Advantage of the Lord's dear People; is the earnest Desire and Request

of

R. S.
J. N.

A Catalogue of Mr. Beverley's Books Sold by William Marshall at the Bible in Newgate-street. And John Marshall at the Bible in Grace-Church-street.

1. **T**HE Catechism of the Kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ, Price 6 d.
2. A Parable of the Ten Virgins, Price 2 s. 6 d.
3. A View of what have hapened this Year concerning the Peace, and the Destruction of the Turk and other Remarks, Price 6 d.
4. The Kingdom of Jesus Christ entring its Succession this 1697. Price 1 s.
5. The Scripture Line of Time, from the first Sabbath, to the great Sabbatism, Price 6 d.
6. A fresh Memorial of the Kingdom of Christ demonstrated, Price 6 d.
7. A Discourse upon the Powers of the World to come, or the miraculous Powers of the Gospel, Price 2 s.
8. The Table of Sabatical Times, with its Scale of Years, Price 2 d.
9. A Scheme of the Prophecy now to be fulfilled, prefixed to the Line of Time, from the first to the last Sabbatism, Price 2 s. 6 d.
10. The Command of God to his People to come out of Babylon, Price 6 d.
11. A Discourse, being the Substance of several Sermons on the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, Price 6 d.
12. A Brief View of the State of Mankind in the First and Second Adam, Price 4 d.
13. An Exposition of the Divine Standard of Prayer, stiled the Lord's Prayer, Price 1 s.
14. A True State of Gospel Truth Established, upon the free Election of God in Christ, Price 6 d.

A Vindication of the Doctrine of *Justification* and *Union* before Faith.

WHEREAS Mr. Coleman, or his Prefacer, have taken occasion to cast Aspersions on the Church at *Rowell*, and on me (*R. Davis*) their Pastor, especially with Reference to *David Culy*, intimating, or terming him one of my Disciples, &c. The Lord forgive the Author that ungodly Speech, with others of the like nature, and that root of bitterness in his Mind whence they did proceed. Surely he had no cause to make any Reflections, or to take up a Reproach against the Church at *Rowell*, and me, because of the offensive, unsound and exorbitant Expressions of the said *David Culy*, so far as we testify'd against them, and faithfully admonished and reprov'd him for them, which it pleased the Lord graciously to succeed unto his Conviction and Repentance, so that he openly retracted them, and declared his Sorrow or Contrition for them; and we do not hear that he hath uttered any such Language, or hath used any such Expressions since that time.

Therefore there cannot be the least Pretence or Excuse for his mentioning or repeating that Matter as a just cause of blame to us, who had manifested our detestation of them, or of Reproach, to *David Culy*, who hath openly declared his Repentance for them, and his Recantation of them, except it were to give vent to the malignity of a depraved Nature, that lusteth unto Envy, and delighteth to be Slandering and Reproaching, which the Lord help him to be mortifying by the power of his Grace.

Since also the Prefacer hath to his mentioning of *David Culy's* untoward and grievous expression, immediately subjoyned my Erroneous Interpretation of *Heb. 2. 14, 15.* as he thinks, with an apparent ill design to insinuate to the World, That I am guilty of the same gross Error which he charges upon *David Culy*, thinking, perhaps, every thing may be believed against a Man whom the most of Professors cry down.

I judge it is my Duty to take notice of his Reflections, and to Vindicate the Exposition I then gave. The Scope of that Sermon was to prove, That Christ upon the Cross did truly and properly bear, or sustain and represent the Persons of the Elect. The Argument to prove it was this, *viz.* That He was their common Head, Root, Surety, Representative. The Foundation of which was, That God the Second Person, according to the Divine Ordination, assumed our Nature into an Hypostatical Union, not only as singly considered, but as being the common Head, Root, &c. of the Elect Number. Therefore when He assumed the nature of the Election into a personal Union, He assumed in that Nature, as a common Head, the Persons of the Election to an Union with Himself, as their Head, Root, Representative. This was then shown, though perhaps not in the same express Words, yet I am sure to the same purpose. This Truth was then inferred from *Heb. 2. 14.* as well as other Scripture.

A Vindication of the Doctrine of

This he saith is *contrary to what any Orthodox Minister ever Asserted*. He means first, either the Truth it self; or, secondly, the deduction of it from that Scripture.

If the *first*, then it is plain the Scripture asserts it, and so several of the Reformers, and he himself also, whilst he is making opposition. What the Scriptures assert see in *Eph. 1. 10*. In which words there are these Terms which ought to be Explained.

I. What is meant by the gathering together in one.

Ans. 1. The Word Imports a gathering of many scattered Sums into one Total Sum.

2. Of divided Parcels of Histories and Arguments into one Summary.

3. Of many Members into one Body, under one Head.

And in general, comprehensive of these Three, to collect and joyn together several into one, even in the fullest Sense that I intend it for.

But, II. What is meant by all things.

Ans. To wave what is said by others, I judge the whole Election is principally intended here.

1. Because the Elect Number in Scripture are stiled Things, *1 Cor. 1. 27, 28*. nay, all Things, (*παντα*, the same Word with this in the Text) *Gal. 3. 22*. But the Scripture hath concluded all under Sin, &c.

2. The Elect Number is the Predicate here, concerning whom the Apostle treats, *viz. Such as were chosen, predestinated, and made accepted from Eternity*, ver. 4, 5, 6. The whole Scope of the Chapter is to speak of such in a limited Sense: Therefore such are those *All Things* mentioned in the Text, *gathered together unto Christ*.

Nor does that overthrow this Exposition, what is here said, *Things in Heaven, as well as things in Earth*. For the Elect Number then gone to Heaven, though they were United to Christ afore, as the appointed Head of the Election; yet, when he Actually and Hypostatically United their Natures, He did therein Unite the Person of every Elect Vessel to Himself, in a more visible close manner, even in that United Nature; and of such also as were then gone to Heaven. For it pleased the Father to hang all the Glory of his House upon Him, *Isa. 22. 24*. even the Vessels of great quantity (such as are perfected in Glory) as well as the Vessels of small quantity, *viz. such as are imperfect Pilgrims here, and the meanest of them as well as the greatest*. And though they were gone to Glory, yet could not in this Sense be made Perfect without us, (*Heb. 11. 40*). *viz. the Elect Number existing after his Incarnation*.

III. What is meant by the Dispensation of the Fulness of Times?

Ans. In short, the time of our Lord's Incarnation. That is the meaning of that Scripture Phraseology. See Gal. 4. 4. But when the Fulness of Time was come, GOD sent forth his Son, made of a Woman, made under the Law. The dubious Terms being Explained, I shall now raise these Observations from the Words pointent, to evince the Truth in question.

1. That God, at a certain Time, collected and summed up the chosen ones into one Sum or Body, under one Head.

2. The Center, in which they all met, or the Head, unto which they were collected, was: CHRIST, *That He might gather together in one, all things in Christ, even in Him*, again reiterated.

3. That this especial Time of gathering of them into One, was in the Fulness of Time, *viz. When the Eternal Word was made Flesh*. For that individual Nature of

umed, was a publick, common, representative One, and by means of that blessed One United thus Hypostatically, He brought into near Union to his own Person, the Persons of the chosen Ones, *John* 17. 21, 22, 23. Whence 'tis evident, our nearness of Union to GOD is founded (as to the means) in this middle Chain, God assuming the Second Man into his own Personality, as a publick Head, that had a numerous Seed in it self, even in his Loins, not in a natural way of Generation, but in a mystical way of transcendent Union. Now all these put together, Establish the Truth firmer than the Pillars of Heaven and Earth, *viz.* When God the Second Person took the Natures of the Election into a personal Union, He took their Persons also in that common Nature, into an Union to Himself, as the Root, Head, and Representative.

Again, all Scriptures that Assert Christ to be a common Head, Root, &c. compared with those that declare the Foundation (as to the mean) to be laid in the Assumption of the Nature of the Election; besides what was mentioned, *viz.* *John* 17. 22. 23. See *Heb.* 2. 11. *ad finem*, prove this Doctrine. So 'tis evident, that 'tis glorious Truth, contained in the Holy Scriptures; and that there needs not this Examination against it.

2. Most of the Sound Divines (according to the Formal Stile of the Day) that I have read, in maintaining Christ's common Headship, and the aforesaid Foundation, not only Assert, but strenuously Defend it. To pick out two or three, *Keckerman*, a judicious Divine, says in his System, *That Christ taking our Natures, is the Foundation of other sorts of Unions of our Persons to Him.*

Mr. Rutherford. Christ and we are not only both, *viz.* Mankind; (for Christ and *Abraham*, and *Judas*, are one Specie, & Natura, true Men) but one in Brotherhood, He assuming the Nature of Man, with special eye to *Abraham*, *Heb.* 2. 16. *i. e.* to the Elect, and Believers: For with them He is Bone of their Bone. and is not ashamed to call them Brethren, *Heb.* 2. 11. 12. *Psal.* 22. 22.

See also *Dr. Goodwin*, on *Eph.* 1. 10. — 3. 17, &c. 'Tis true, I should not be forward to produce Authorities, even of great and good Men, because there is a carnal Proneness in Professors, to have their Mouths sooner stopped with what Men say, than what the Word of God says; whence 'tis very likely to ensue, That Men's Faith will be resolved into Humane Authority, as the Complaint was of such a fatal Consequence, after some Assaulted Truths were determined by General Councils; and so this way of Defence impress a deeper Gangreen upon our Holy Profession, than the Wound it pretends at present to heal: But hereunto I was now necessitated to give some Check to that peremptory Allegation, That what was then delivered was contrary to what any Orthodox Minister ever delivered.

Having manifested 'tis not contrary to Scripture in the Sense afore explained, nor to the Sense of Sound Divines, it will be no hard matter to make it appear, that it is not contrary to his own Judgment, from the Objection he states to make the dirt stick the more, *viz.* — *He only meant Christ assumed their Persons representatively.* I shall therefore take notice of the Objection, and his Answer, more fully: At present, I observe this, that therein he himself seems to grant, That Christ did assume the Persons of the Election representatively.

But, Secondly, If he mean, That never did any deduce that Truth from that Portion of Scripture, or else both. I ask him,

1. How does he know that? Has he read all the Writers of Divinity down from the Greek and Latine Fathers, to the smallest Modern Author in our Days? or,

2. If he has, yet has he known all that every Orthodox Minister that has, or does now live in the World, has Preached or Discours'd on this Matter, or deduced from that Text in the Hebrew: Then how with a Conscience tender of Truth, can such a thing be thus universally Affirmed? I have already quoted one, *viz.* Mr. *Rutherford*, that infers what's tantamount from the same Scripture, in his Book of the *Covenant*, quoted by Dr. *Chauncey*, in his Book against Mr. *Williams*, Page 223. Mark what he Writes, *That Christ, and the Election, are not only one Natura & Specie, but in Brotherhood too, He assuming the Nature of Man, with a special Eye to Abraham, i.e. The Elect and Believers*; proving it from this very place. And pray what is this less than I Asserted? But suppose none ever had, yet still it is no Argument to me against the Exposition. Do not we pray for, and expect great Light to break forth in the last Days; and that this Light will help the Saints to see further into the Word of God, than any other of his Servants since the Antichristian Apostacy? What offence should it be then, if the meanest of God's Servants should be taught from a particular Scripture, what others of his Servants have not been before? However, I shall lay down the Reasons that moved me to expound the Words so, and leave them to the Censure of the discerning Christian.

1. The design of the Context is to set forth the Union between the Election and Christ, as their Head and Root. He positively asserts it in the eleventh Verse, and proves it in the subsequent Verses, by these Mediums. 1. That He owns them as Brethren. 2. As Children (Expressions denoting great nearness of Relation.) 3. His living by Faith, as their Head and Exemplar; which Mediums are confirmed by the Authority of the Old Testament. See ver. 11. 12, 13. Next he argues it from the proximate Cause thereof, *viz.* His being made very Man; which he also proves, 1. From his Believing, ver. 13. 2. From the necessity of his being so, in order to attain the ends of Representativenesship, ver. 14, 15. Forasmuch then as the Children were partakers of Flesh and Blood, He also himself likewise took part of the same, &c. This 16th. Verse seems to me again to repeat this Medium, and so draw the Conclusion, *viz.* And having assumed the nature of the Election, He is qualified to be an United Head and Representative to them. And this is further confirmed by the Subsequent Verse, That therefore He apparently is a suitable High-Priest, which is the same with a Representative. For that was one of the designments of the Priest under the Law, in reference to the People, *viz.* to represent them in Sacrificing, and in the High-Priests entring into the Holy of Holies, with the Names of the Tribes Engraven upon his Breast-Plate.

2. I argue the reality of this Inference from Remarks on the Words themselves.

1. The Word Nature is not in the Original, and there is no need of having it understood. The Word *ἐπιλαμβάνει*, Governing a Genitive Case, as well as an Accusative, without altering the Sense; as is evident not only in Heathen Authors, but in the New Testament, *Heb.* 8. 9. Implying there such an Apprehension, as signifies taking the Hand to himself, as the Word from the Etymology must needs, and does import. Then the Sense will be, That He assumed not to himself Angels, but the Seed of *Abraham*. And,

2. 'Tis plain in Scripture Language, it signifies not only the Nature, but also the Per-

Justification and Union before Faith.

Persons in that Nature into such an Union as may be between a Representative and those represented by Him. These Premises duly weighed, it will follow, that the Consequence of the *Prefacer's Argument* is very illogical, and wrested greatly beyond the Rules of Art and right Reason. He may as well argue, because the Second Person took the nature of the Election into an Hypothetical, that therefore He took it into the Essential Union. And because He made it one Person with himself, therefore He Deified it: As to argue, because He took the Persons of the Election into a Federal Union in that common Nature of theirs, He took them into Personal Union with himself, and so Christed them all. I blest God I abhor the Position as well as himself. Nor (though he does most unchristianly insinuate it) can he by any solid Argument make it out, but by guessing at my meaning, which is like one of Mr. *Williams Inuendos* on Dr. *Crisp's Works*. The Reason given why I must thus mean is, because it was not brought in under that Head of Christ's Representativenesship. But with submission, unless he can prove it was brought in under a Head, that laboured to prove that Christ assumed our Persons into an Hypothetick Union with himself, and so made Christs of them all, he does nothing. I appeal to his Conscience, whether any such thing was industriously laboured to be evinced in that Sermon. But further to clear it, That that, and no other could be my meaning, I must trouble the Reader again with a Rehearsal, viz. That the whole Scope of that Sermon was to Answer a Question delivered me in Writing, viz. *Whether Christ did truly and properly sustain and represent the Persons of the Election on the Cross*. It was affirmed as a glorious Truth. The chief Argument then used to prove it was this, That if Christ was the common Head, or Root, Surety and Representative of the Elect Number, then He Sustained their Persons, &c. But the Scriptures of Truth did assert Christ to be the common Head, Root, &c. and that two ways.

1. By Stiling our Lord so in express Terms, as to Head, Root and Surety.

2. By ascribing to Him, in reference to the Elect Ones, the highest and most peculiar Things, that the Notion of a Root or Head, Surety and Representative does import amongst Men. And then I came to shew that the Foundation of such a Relation between Christ and Elect Persons, was laid in his assuming their Natures into a personal Union with himself.

The *Prefacer* says, I brought it not in under that Head, wherein I shewed, That whatever is included in the Notion of a Representative amongst Men, is applied to Christ in the Scriptures. But what if not? And what if brought in under any of them, is it not the same? What if it was brought in under the Head of Christ's being held forth as a Root, and Surety, is it not the same import? and can he upon fair construction scrow my Meaning to a higher strain from thence? Dare he in the presence of God, the Searcher of Hearts say, That my meaning was to prove that all the Elect Number by this Union are Christed with Christ? If not, I would appeal to his Conscience, when it is nearest the Throne, Whether it be in him an act of unfeigned Brotherly Love, to insinuate this of me in Print to the World? And whether he could be so served himself? If I had delivered any thing ambiguous, it had been a Christian part in him to have discours'd me about my meaning first.

Lastly, The Quotation from Dr. *Owen* is as trifling, as the imaginary Consequence am loaded with; Dr. *Owen* only denying (as I also do) that the Second Person assumed the Persons of the Election in an Hypothetical Union with himself, as He did

A Vindication of the Doctrine of

our Natures. But neither here, nor elsewhere denying, that in such an Assumption of the Nature of the Elect, as a common Nature, or common Head, Root, &c. He did also assume every individual Person of the Election into a Natural, Federal, and Legal Union with himself (as Mr. *Rutherford* Phrases it,) which is the Truth between us under debate. Therefore it is as unfair to insinuate that Dr. *Owen* speaks against me, as 'tis to insinuate, I meant what I never did. Though the Authority of Dr. *Owen* (whom I honour as a Learned and a good Man) if it were so, would be but a meer Humane Authority.

And hence an occasion is offered me to declare against the Practices of Writers in these Days who are Adversaries to the Truth; 1. That they hide their own Principles under an Ambiguous Form of Words. 2. They wrest the Positions of their Adversaries, and put them to the rack to speak what they would have them. 3. They quote some Sentences of Orthodox Men, that in a slighty reading may chime a little towards their Opinion, to patronize Assertions which they know they abhorred, and make the credulous People (whose Faith they know to be determined by great Names) believe such and such great Men were of that Judgment.

If they would examine these Practices by the Rule of God's Word, they would find the first to be a Falshood, with an intent to deceive. The Second, a wrongful Accusing and Condemning the Innocent, by a tyrannick Force put upon their Words, with an intent to destroy them or their Reputations. The Third, a forcing good Men to be false Witnesses against their will and design; all which I reckon to be foul Immoralities, which must be accounted for to the Judge of *quick and dead, at his appearing*; being they are also refined, yet Malevolent Persecutions of the Glorious Gospel.

The *Prefacer* has also hereupon took occasion to nibble at Mr. *Eyres's* Book; but Mr. *Eyres* stands in need of no great Defence from such an Assault: for his Arguments stand yet untouched for ought that can be perceived. Yet some few and slight Animadversions may be necessary for stating of Truth (if it may be) and put some end to Controversies and Clamours, if it be the will of God.

1. I judge it not necessary to speak both to Union and Justification, which the *Prefacer* has jumbled into one. Mr. *Eyres's* Assertions (which are opposed) are in his Book about *Justification*.

2. Though Mr. *Eyres*, and others, have Explained what they meant about *Eternal Justification*; and though this Explanation has not been disapproved of, nor judged by many unsound, yet a strife has been kept on foot under the shield of meer Words (that only have been rendred odious to the Vulgar, by a meer Noise and Clamour) for to uphold Parties in Religion, and make those (whom Christ does and will own as his Ministers) abhorred in their Names, Writing, and Preaching, of the generality of Professors and others.

3. Notwithstanding all these discouragements, I shall once more attempt to see how far Mr. *Eyres*, with others, and their Revilers, can be brought to an Agreement. *ἵνα τὸ αὐτὸ ὁμολογῶν*, to mean however the same thing, if they will not, *τὸ αὐτὸ λεγόντων*, to speak the same thing; that so (if it be the will of God) Controversies may be ended, unnatural Heats and Animosities among Brethren extinguished, and *Peace and Prosperity may yet flourish in the Palaces of Zion*.

This diminishen

This Prefacer declares, That he, Mr. Coleman, and others hold,

1. That all the Chosen of God are Decretively Justified, &c. from Eternity.

2. Virtually, at the Death of Christ.

3. Yet, that no Adult and Elect Person is really and actually Justified before he doth Believe in Him.

As to the First, I find Mr. Eyres agrees with him, and so do I, provided his meaning and ours be the same. And therefore I shall speak the Truth in love to those who are Brethren (being, notwithstanding all our Differences, yet Members one of another in the Lord) with the Premise of these distinctions.

1. Justification and Justified, are in a Sense Relatives, mutually inferring one another. In what Sense soever God's Decree of Justifying was the Elect Person's Eternal Justification, in that Sense the Elect Person was Eternally Justified. But yet, Justification is two fold, either *Active* or *Passive*, according to Sound Divines.

Justification *Active* is God's Act towards, or upon the Person, *Rom. 3. 21.*

Towards the Person, as an Act of his Secret or revealed Will, going forth towards the Object (the Elect Sinner) either in his Representative, Being, or Actual Existence.

And as considered in his Actual Existence more secretly applied to his Person, as Actually Existing, or more sensibly and manifestly, by terminating the Act on Conscience.

Justification *Passive* is the effect of God's Act towards, and upon the Person; which is the Discharge that the Sinner receives and possesses by Faith in the Conscience.

I take Justification in this latter Sense as *Passive*.

There is a real difference between God Justifying the Person, and the Person being Justified. For God may really Justify a Person, when he receives it not; but he must actually receive God's Act by Faith upon the Conscience, before he can be thus Justified or Discharged. And the Sinner being thus actively Justified, doth necessarily possess not only his actual being, but his being a Sinner; and actually Arraigned in Conscience, in order to such an actual Conscience discharge.

These Distinctions premised, I shall plainly give my Sense from Mr. Eyres own Words, what I apprehend he means by God's Eternal Act, decretively Justifying the Sinner, and what he means by the Sinners being decretively Justified from Eternity.

However, I shall give my own Sentiments, with as much Plainness as I can set down by Words.

Mr. Eyres distinguishes Justification into *Volitio Divina*, and *Res Voluta*, viz. 1. The Will of God not to punish, or impute Sin to his People: And, 2. The effect of God's Will, His not punishing of them, or setting them free from the Curse of the Law, Page 88.

He says that by decretive Justification, he means the former of these, being of the same moment therein with Dr. Twisse, Page 89 And also the Agreement between the Father

and the Son, from Eternity, upon that sure and everlasting Covenant, That his Elect should never bear the Punishment which their Sins would deserve, Page 90. ult. 91. init. And this

is more than Justification in the Decree, for it is Justification in the Compact also.

This appears plainly to be Mr. Eyres's Judgment about God's Justifying Elect Sinners from Eternity; of whose Judgment I profess my Self to be in this matter.

'Tis plain also, Mr. Eyres means Elect Sinners are Justified from Eternity, *Terminantibus* (as the School-Men Phrase it) even in that Representative-being

they had in their Head, set up by the Decree from Everlasting, *Prov. 8. 23.* As the Decree gave an *esse futuro* to the whole Creation, so the Decree, as it was the Sovereign Pleasure of his Goodness, gave also an *esse Representativo* to the new Creation or Election of God, which is yet higher than a meer being of Futurity. For that good pleasure of his Will did more effectually constitute and call those things, that are now as though they were, than any other of his Decrees. Besides, as they were Covenanted with from Eternity, in their Head and Redeemer, they received in Him, as such an Head (*viz.* He receiving it for them) the Promise of Eternal Life, wherein was included *Justification of Life, Titus 1. 2. 2 Tim. 1. 9.*

Now therefore this meaning of Eternal Justification, either the Prefacer and his Fellow-Opposers, either approves or disapproves of. If he disapproves thereof, why has he not set about a solid Refutation of a Doctrine he apprehends so dangerous, instead of Squirting at it with invidious Consequences, that follow no more from the Premises, than if one should argue thus; *The Staff stands in the Chimney-Corner, therefore it Rains.*

But, Secondly, If he approves of this Explication of Decretive Justification (as he styles it) why does he not say so, and not represent Mr. Eyles, and others, as Persons suspicious of dangerous Heresie; and assign no other grounds for it, but that (*first*) Mr. Eyles has so weightily Answered Objections against this Eternal Act of God's Will, being called Justification, Page 94, 95. when also this Author makes not the least attempt to enervate his Answers, or to shew the weakness of his Arguments. Or, Secondly, That Page 45. he infers from Mr. Rutherford, (that was a great Enemy of *Antinomianism*) *That the Elect before Conversion and Faith, stand actually reconciled to GOD, and justified afore Him.* For if God has by an Act of his, pardoned their Sins afore they Believe (as Mr. Rutherford says) then as Reconciliation is an Act of God, and on that part they thus stand actually Reconciled, or justified in his sight, as before the Eye of his satisfied Justice before they Believe. Or, Thirdly, Because he has asserted Page 46. That this was the certain and actual Effect of the Death of Christ, that the Elect were thereby free from the Law, delivered from the Curse, reconciled unto God, made perfect and compleat in the sight of God, *viz.* in Christ, as their Head and Surety, in whom there was, upon his Resurrection, made over to them, an undoubted right to all these afore-named Blessings, &c. as he explains himself in several places in his Book, but particularly from Page 58. to the end of that Chapter; but more of this, perhaps, hereafter.

But to bring this Matter in debate, into some narrow Compals again for the ending of it, I again affirm, That what we intend by Eternal Justification, must be looked upon by our Smilers, to be either Truth or Error, and if Truth, yet very ill worded, or else why all this noise? What we mean has been plainly expressed, both privately and publickly: And if the Prefacer, and the rest, judges it an Error, let them manifest it from God's Word, and sound Arguments deduced from thence, and they shall be attended to, either by a Recantation, if convinced, or else by Reasons given to the contrary.

I shall therefore again, as I promised, repeat plainly, what I apprehend Eternal Justification to be, *viz.* That it is God's Eternal Will and Decree, not to punish the Elect Sinner, though he would Transgress. And his will not to punish, is formally Pardon, in the Mind of God, and the non-imputation of sin.

As the Sovereign or Elect that God hath chosen, are not bound by any Covenant, as such, in this world, but his Eternal Will, why he should be so, is not a necessary, in the S U S, from the Lord's affirming, there is no on (as he is) suspicious, Mr. Eyrill, being it attempts Secondly, *Antinomian* O D, before the and on the the Eye of the Spirit, as affected, that a vile unclean, their Head, an unclean, in several, but more, the ending, he looks, and words, private, manifest, shall be, ven to the, and Eternal, in the Election, pardon,

'Tis I grant you his Decree; but this Decree is such an Act of Pardon, that has it all completeness of being in it self from Eternity, before the Elect began to have a being, &c. as the Act of Election and Reprobation. Mr. Rutherford Vind. gr. Pag. This Act hath no more pre-suppose the existency of its Object, than the Decree of Election hath.

As God's Eternal purpose, to set apart a determinate Number for Himself from Eternity, was his actual Electing, and setting of them apart, as an Act in his own breast, in like manner, his Eternal Sovereign Pleasure, not to punish them, though Offenders, is as complete an Act of Pardon, in his own breast, and of his secret Will, as any can be.

Again, I think *Eternal Justification* is the *Eternal good pleasure of his Will*, that the Elect should be completely Righteous in the Righteousness of another, viz. his Son Jesus Christ, and this is a complete *Judicial Act*, *Eternal and Immanent*, as Mr. Rutherford affirms. *The absolving Sentence, as conceived in his Mind, by the Decree of Justification*, as Dr. Ames asserts: Observe what he says; That in the very Decree of Justification, there is the very Sentence of Abolition or Justification, though not Pronounced, but Conceived, Ratified and Recorded, in that Sovereign Will that is the Supreme Law, and *High Court of Chancery*.

'Tis this Eternal Pleasure of his good Will, is the fundamental Reason why a Sinner should be made and pronounced Righteous in the Righteousness of another: This does not arise from the nature of the Covenant of Works, nor any Transaction, but that Second, a lasting One between the Father and the Son. The Faith of a poor Creature must be upon good Ground for receiving this Mystery, viz. his being completely Righteous in a Righteousness without him, that is inherent in another. And where can it receive original Satisfaction, but from this Sovereign Act of God's Will, as revealed and on the Word of his Grace? What Answer must be given to Sense (yea, to the Eye of the Spirit) and fleshly Wisdom in this matter, but this? That a Gracious God has so ordained it as an Act of Sovereign Grace, which is that original Act, that constitutes and makes Persons, whilst in themselves imperfect and sinful, completely righteous in the Eye of Justice and the Law, in Christ Jesus and his Righteousness, through a mysterious Commutation of Persons.

Lastly, I think *Eternal Justification*, is that Eternal Grant of the Father, to the Lord, the Head of the Election, upon his Engagement to perform Conditions perfectly, of Grace, and amongst the rest, of this of Justification to Life to Him and his, in that compact ratified in Eternity between them both. Thus was the Promise of Eternal life given forth to us in our Head, before the World began, Tit. 1. 2. And thus there is not only Grace purposed in God acting Essentially, but Grace given forth from God acting Subsistentially, by way of Covenant Transaction for us, before the Foundation of the World, 2 Tim. 1. 9.

This is all that I plainly mean by *Justification from Eternity*; and do sincerely declare, that thereby I do not mean, That the actual Payment was made by Christ from Eternity (though He engaged, and his Word was taken by the Father;) nor I mean, That the Elect had any Eternal Being, save of Futurity and Representativeness; nor that God's Act was applied to them, as Personally Existing from Eternity, and no other to them personally, than in that Representative Being they had in our Head. Nor that this Eternal Act hindered their being rooted in the First Adam, or

placed for apparent Felicity upon the bottom of a Covenant of Works; nor did it secure them from falling thence into a state of Sin or Misery, in reference to the First *Adam*, and that Covenant, and this, in subserviency to the Covenant of Grace: Nor by Divine Ordination was this Eternal Act enough to rescue them from the visible apparent Curse of the Law, and manifest displeasure of Justice, without a Righteousness actually wrought out, and brought in for them: Nor was this secret Eternal Sentence to Justify them in their own Consciences, till as declared and pronounced by ways of God's appointment, it was received into the Conscience of the Sinner actually existing, and actually Arraigned at the Bar of Conscience by the Faith of God's Elect, wrought in them by the irresistible Power of the Spirit of God.

Thus have I told my meaning of *Eternal Justification*; if I am Erroneous, I desire this *Prefacer*, or Mr. *Coleman*, or any other, from God's Word, and in the Spirit of Meekness, to endeavour my Conviction. But if the *Prefacer*, and our Opposers, judge the Fault only to lie in the wording of it, then I say, why this Heat and Displeasure merely about Words? And especially, when they that affirmed, that these afore-mentioned Acts of God, may be properly enough stiled *Justification*, were Men of Eminent Parts, Godliness, Reading, Learning, and Skill in Polemical Divinity; such as *Pemle*, *Twisse*, *Rutherford*, *Ames*, besides Mr. *Eyres*, who are to this Day reputed justly by the godly Learned, to be as Famous Men as *England* bred, and never taxed with *Antinomianism*, except by Mr. B——r, and his Admirers: And not only so, but when these also gave such Reasons for their Judgment, as I have not seen hitherto Answered.

I say, the *Prefacer* had done well to have seriously weighed Mr. *Eyres's* Reasons, *Page 89, 90, &c.* why the Eternal Will of God not to Punish the Elect, should be called *Actual Justification*; and if he had not liked his Arguments, like a Christian, and a Disputant, from Scripture and sound Reason, should have endeavoured to shew their weakness and absurdity. He should have considered, whether *Justification* be barely the declaring of a Sinner Righteous, or the Constituting also a Sinner, and making him Righteous; and given his Reasons, why 'tis only the former, and not the latter; and answer what is Alledged, for making or Constituting a Person Righteous: As,

1. That is *Justification* to which the definition of *Justification* does agree; but the Eternal Act of God's Will counting, and so Constituting the Elect Righteous in CHRIST's Righteousness, is according to the definition of *Justification*: Therefore, &c.

The Proposition is an undeniable Maxim. The Assumption leans, *first*, on that Definition the Scripture gives of it. See *Psal. 32. 1, 2.* compar'd with *Rom. 4. 6, 8.* as Explained by Mr. *Eyres*, *Page 90.* *Secondly*, on the usual Acceptation of it amongst Men. For Forgiveness amongst Men is principally an Act of the Heart; as when a Man purpoeis in himself not to take Revenge, then he doth forgive. But,

2. The Word *Justifie* doth signifie in its *Etymology*, and common acceptation in the Civil Law, to make one just, as well as to declare one just; and Sinners cannot be made Just, but by two ways: *first*, either Infusion; or, *secondly*, Imputation of Righteousness. The *first* we deny, as *Papish* and *false*: For, 1. None by Infusion are made perfectly Righteous here, so as to answer the demands of the Law. 2. Yet if so, it would not do, unless also Satisfaction was made to Justice for Violations of the Law, by

did it
 First
 Nor
 le ap-
 pfulness
 nence
 days of
 lifting,
 ght in
 desire
 spirit of
 profers,
 d Diff
 t these
 e Men
 vinity;
 ay re-
 never
 t only
 een hi-
 casons,
 ould be
 ristian,
 o shew
 tion be
 r, and
 not the
 Righte-
 out the
 ous in
 There-
 on that
 4, 6, 8,
 amongst
 when
 in the
 not be
 f Right-
 ion are
 et if so,
 e Law,
 by

Sufferings of an infinite Nature. Then it must be by Imputation, and that Funda-
 mentally being an Act in God's Mind, is granted to be from Eternity.
 3. God will not declare Persons Righteous, but those that are so in some real Sense
 other; for the Judgment of God is according to Truth; therefore the making or
 constituting Persons Righteous, is as necessary an Ingredient unto Justification, as the
 declaring of them so to be. And they are made Righteous in the sight of Justice, only
 by Imputation, as afore proved.
 4. The Acts of God's secret Will may have the same Name with those of his Re-
 vealed; nay, the Acts of his revealed Will borrow their Names from the Acts of his
 secret Will. Thus God's manifesting his Love, is called his Love in Scripture Dia-
 log; but yet it takes its Name from that everlasting good Pleasure of his Will towards
 us. So his Eternal Act is called his Election, and in like manner his Temporary Act
 And why not his Will to declare Sinners Righteous upon the account of another's
 righteousness, be called his Imputation of Righteousness, and consequently also, his
 justification of them?
 But instead of this there's nothing offered to invalidate Mr. Eyres's Arguments, and
 answers, but, 1. That Letter frequently builds, *viz.* The difference between the Decree
 and the Execution. 2. A misimproved Similitude. 3. Illogical Consequences.
 The Objection started by him to make way for his Answer, is not fairly stated; and
 the Answer given, though consisting of many Lines, yet may be summed up into
 three, *viz.* *There is a distinction between the Decree to Justifie, and Justification it self.*
God Decreed to Create the World from Eternity, but did not Create it till Time. To
 which I Answer;
 1. That though there be a difference between the Decree, and the Execution of the
 decree, yet may not both be called by the same Name? As God's Eternal Will to
 order all manner of Blessings on such and such, is called *His Eternal Love towards*
us, Jer. 31. 3. Eph. 1. 5. compar'd with Chap. 2. 4. So his manifesting Love in
 us, is called *His love, or loving of them*, Hos. His Eternal Will to bring them out of
 misery, is called *His Mercy*, Plal. 103. 17. And his actual bringing of them out of
 such an Estate of Misery, is also called, *His having Mercy on them*, Rom. 9. 15, 16, &c.
 His Eternal Decree to call Persons out of Misery to Himself, is called *His actual Ele-*
ction of them, Eph. 1. 4. And so his calling of them forth in time, is called in Scrip-
 ture Language, *His Election*, John 15. 16, &c. Whence the Distinction among
 these Divines, of *Eternal and Temporary Election*.
 2. We must distinguish between God's Decree of a relative Change, and that of a
 positive Change; the foundation of such Relation's being existing in the Immutable Pur-
 pose of God, and the Relation exists as soon as the Foundation, and in this respect does
 not pre-suppose the Actual Existence of the Correlate. But 'tis sufficient, if they have
 the being of Futurity, or Representativenesship.
 3. God, in willing Persons to be Righteous in another's Righteousness, doth not *will* to
 do, or *count* to count, but 'tis one continued Act in Him from Eternity: And from
 eternity has its *totum esse in se completur*, as the Act of Election, &c. according to Mr.
 Herbert, &c. Imputation is fundamentally an Act in God's Mind, and Acts in his
 mind are Eternal. 'Tis true, *God's Will* to Create or Sanctify, is his Act, but the
 execution thereof, *viz.* Sanctification and Creation, is his Work, and therefore differ
 from

from his Decree to Justifie, and the Execution of it taken in an *Active Sense*. For his Decree to Justifie is his Act, so the Execution thereof is, and take the Execution God's Act declaring; but which way you will, 'tis still but a Copy of the Original his own Mind. Whence is inferred (if you will) this plainer distinction: There difference between his *Will* to act an Act concerning us; for his very *Will* is the very *Act* in substance; and his *Will* to work a work upon a Subject. The difference between the Decree, and the execution thereof in the former, being no more than this: That it is so; and the appearing of it to be so. In the latter, the Execution is a Physical Change wrought upon the Subject. Therefore the Inference from the one to the other will not hold, for the Similitude halts.

2. All Similitudes in general do not prove; so this particular Similitude our Prefacer brings to confute Dr. Twisse's, and Mr. Eyre's Definition of *Justification*, (Pag. 10. of the *Introduit.*) does not illustrate any thing to the purpose. The Definition it meddles not with; but only faintly strikes at another Assertion of Dr. Twisse's, viz. That *Justification* (I think the Doctor has it Christ's Righteousness) is *ours afore we believe, in respect of right, &c. but though not in possession and enjoyment*. The Dr. here distinguishes truly between a bare right, and a right with a possession. The Prefacer, to overthrow his Distinction, uses the very same himself; For, says he — *Can that Child be said actually to have the possession of that Estate long afore 'tis born?* No, Dr. Twisse denies that, as well as he; and only affirms there is an undoubted right for them, but no possession 'till they Believe. And the very same thing is said by the Prefacer, to enervate the Doctor's Distinction. The Difference would be quickly compounded, if he stop here: But he advances such *Distinctions* to overthrow the Doctor's, as Subtle *Scotus* never found out. He distinguishes between *right*, and 1. *proper right*, 2. *personal right*, 3. *virtual right*, Pag. 10. l. 30. 32. Yet seriously this is but meer trifling, to please the common sort of a Party, and not solid Argumentation: For such *Distinctions* are without Foundation, which I prove by these Reasons: 1. 'Tis a known Maxim amongst the Learned, *Omne analogum per se positum stat pro famoso vi significato*, viz. Every Name of a thing put alone, is to be took in the most comprehensive Sense of that thing; so that the Word (*right*) comprehends *all manner of Right*, even *personal, proper, actual, &c.* Wherefore there can be no distinction between *right*, and *actual, proper, personal right*; for the Members of a *Distinction* ought not to be subordinate to each other.

2. The Members of a *Distinction* ought to be opposite to each other, therefore the opposite Member to a *proper right* is not *right*, but *improper right*, and then his *Distinction* runs thus: A Child afore he is born, has an *improper right* to an Estate conveyed to him by the firmest Conveyance in Law, but not a *proper right*; Ergo, the *Elect* afore they believe, have an *improper right*, but not a *proper right* to *Justification*. So again, The lawful opposite Members of the *Distinction* to *Personal*, in this Position afore us is *impersonal*, or else I know not what; For though it be a good *Distinction* to say, to possess by, or in our own Persons, and possess in and by an Head and Surety (Believers now possessing Heaven by their Head, the Fore-runner for them entered, yet in their own Persons they do not possess Heaven yet.) But notwithstanding 'tis no lawful *Distinction* that's framed between having a *right* in our Person, and *right* in our Surety; for all *right* to Spiritual Blessings in an Head, is to Persons his Spiritual Seed and Members; nor is the Question concerned, whether they Exist, or no Exist.

Exist, for 'tis to Persons in *esse Representativo*, as well as *esse Realit*: And the Persons of the Election (in the same Sense) have a right to Spiritual Blessings, amongst which is *Justification of Life*, and that alone, by and in a Head or Surety: So that his Argument founded on this *Distinction* must run thus: As a Child afore he is Born has not a Personal, but an Impersonal Right; so the Elect, afore they Believe, have only an Impersonal, and not a Personal Right to God's Justifying Act: What then I pray? Did God, when He Justified them in their Head, Justifie them only as Things or Names, and not as Persons? I leave it to the *Prefacer* himself now to Judge, whether there be any thing of Solid Right, in these *Two Distinctions*, when thus they are made to appear obvious in all their strength and weakness?

And now I pass on to consider his *Third*, between *Right*, and *Virtual Right*: The due *Opposite* of *Virtual* or *Potential* (which is one and the same) is *Actual*, and then thus his *Distinction* runs. The *Elect* afore Believing have a *Potential Right*, but not an *Actual Right* to Christ's Righteousness. For though *Actual* and *Virtual*, or *Potential*, be *opposite Members* of a *Distinction*, yet that *Distinction* cannot be applied to *Right*, as being that that subsists in God's actual Grant: And as is the Grant, so is the Right. And I cannot see there can be any Right, *quatenus Right*, but what's *Actual*. This will yet appear more plainly, if we enquire into the nature of *Right* amongst Men, as it adequates, to this the Election have to Blessings in a Spiritual Sense, even afore they Believe. A Right is that Equity and Justice, that entitles a Person not yet born, to an Estate by virtue of a grant from him, who has full power to grant it, contained in Writings Legally Signed and Sealed, and conveyed by way of Lineal Descent, or otherwise. This Grant is either conditional or unconditional; if conditional, the *Habendum* is suspended, 'till the Conditions be performed, and no Right does arise to the Party 'til then: But if unconditional, the Right then stands undoubted, as soon as the Grant is Legally Confirmed; unless the Granting Party has no Legal Power to make such Grants, or intending to deceive, leaves irreparable Flaws in the Writings: And in this respect then the Right becomes false, or at least dubious; so that this sort of Right may be divided into true or false, dubious or undoubted, conditional, or unconditional.

But there is no colour to distinguish them, with our Author, into proper, or improper, personal, or impersonal, actual, or potential: After the same manner, the Right of the Elect Number to Christ's Righteousness, and other Spiritual Blessings is founded, and does arise from God's Eternal good Pleasure in Election, His Engagement in the Eternal Compact, Published to them in a free and sure Promise, Ratified and sealed by the Blood of Jesus, the grand Purchaser. In this Eternal Grant in the Deed and Compact, God had the individual Persons of the whole Election in his Eye. So had the Lord Jesus in his Eye every individual Person of them in his Engagement and Purchase: So that the *Right* is in it self actual, proper, real and personal; the Grant being actually and really made to the Persons of the Election, as considered in Christ their Head.

Let the *Prefacer* therefore speak out what he means, when he affirms the Right to be Impersonal, Improper, and only Potential; sure it cannot be that 'tis a false Right, that would reflect on God's Sovereignty, or Faithfulness, or the security of the Covenant, God's Word and Oath, or the value and worth of the Obedience and Blood of Jesus. Does he mean the Right is doubtful? A doubtful Title does arise from

the afore-mentioned Flaws, and I do not think sure he means this, *viz.* That it is doubtful in it self, but only to the Conscience of a Sinner through Unbelief. But if by those Words are meant the Grant is conditional; then that is out of Doors also, since the Death and Obedience of the Lord Jesus, who performed all Conditions fully, unless it be for a new Law with milder Terms and Conditions: So that it appears by such Quibbling Distinctions, he more truly Fights with Shadows, than Mr. *Eyres*, or Dr. *Twisse*: And let me tell him, that Reflection upon Dr. *Twisse*, and Mr. *Eyres*, might have been better spared. Their Learned Adversaries will not account them Triflers, and would judge it Falshood in Men of Learning to do so. What then must that Censure be esteemed as dropping from the Pen of Mr. *Coleman*, and his *Prefacer*, Men whose Education is well known amongst their Neighbours; I fear no less than fulsom Vanity. But in fine, Dr. *Twisse*, and Mr. *Eyres* Assertion, concerning *Eternal Justification*, receives not so much as a scratched Face by this Similitude. And,

Thirdly, The less does he fail in his Attempts to overthrow it in his interspersed false Consequences at last, as shall be manifested in its due place.

Thus far have I laboured to try how far we can agree in the *Prefacer's* First Position, *viz.* That all the Chosen of God, &c. are decretively Justified from Eternity. I shall proceed now to the Second, *viz.*

That they are *Vertually Justified at the Resurrection of Christ*. And here I maintain;

1. That God the Father's Act towards Christ then, was his actual Justifying of Him, as our common Head and Surety.

2. That Christ, as our Surety in our room and stead, was actually Justified from all the Sins of the Chosen of God charged upon Him. Hence he was unloosed from the Bands and Chains of Death Judicially, and made to sit at the Right Hand of the Majesty on high.

3. That by this Act passed upon Christ, all his Spiritual Seed was actually Justified in Him, in respect of God's Act, and Christ's actual Justification in every Sense, as their Surety.

4. But yet they are not actually Justified with Christ, 'till their Believing; wherein they are made in some measure conformable unto the Resurrection of Christ: 'Till then they are not brought out of the Dungeon of a natural State; nor are the Fetters of Spiritual Death knocked off, 'till they receive, by Faith, that Justifying Act passed upon Christ into their own Consciences, whereby they are made to Rise with Him. And therefore, to be brief and plain, I thus word it:

The Chosen Ones are actually Justified in Christ ever since his Resurrection; but Vertually only with Christ, 'till they Believe; and so Dr. *Goodwin* Explains it: The *Prefacer* knows best whether we agree herein. However, this is my present Light, and I have worded my Judgment as plain as I can; Only here I must subjoyn, That Faith possesses in the Conscience, that Justifying Act of God passed upon Christ, as the Sinners Head and Surety. Here I forbear to argue, because I know not, but things being thus Explained, the *Prefacer* and I may be of a mind.

5. The *Prefacer* Asserts, That no Adult Elect Person is really and actually in Union with Christ, and actually Justified, afore he doth Believe on Him.

To which I say, 1. I shall not insist upon Union, that being not the Subject handled by

Mr. Eyres, and some-what already being spoke to that, and may be some-what more hereafter.

2. I understand not that Limitation, viz. To Adult Elect Persons; for it plainly in-
fants may be really and actually in Union with Christ, and actually Justified
ere Faith; and then it will need Explanation; Whether all Infants, or those that die
their Infancy? And if Infants in general, How come those that live to be Adult, to
again their Actual Union and Justification, till recovered by Faith. But take it in
loosest Sense, it plainly implies, That there are two sorts of Actual Unions and Ju-
fications; one to Elect Infants, or at least them that die in their Infancy, and another
Adult Persons Elect, which I confess I do not understand.

3. He grants himself real and actual Union, which is Union on Christ's part afore
they Believe.

4. Yet *tho* far I agree with him, That no Person is actually Justified afore he
Believe.

1. If you take Justification as God's Act terminated on the Conscience, as received
Faith.

Or, Secondly, If you take Justification in a Passive Sense, as the Effect of this Act
God, viz. The Soul being actually brought out of the Dungeon and Fetters of a
natural State (as rooted in the first Adam) into the Liberty of Christ Jesus, raised
from the Death of Sin, and quickned with Christ, and so in some measure made con-
formable to the Resurrection of their Head Christ.

But if he means thereby, first, God's Eternal, non-imputing of Sin, was not real
and actual: Or,

Secondly, That Christ's Satisfaction upon the Cross was not an actual Payment: Or,

Thirdly, That Christ, when He rose from the Dead, took not out an actual, for-
mal, legal Discharge or Justification, for Himself, and all his Seed, the Chosen of
God: Or,

Fourthly, That He was not actually Justified in every Sense, as their Surety and
Fruits: Or,

Fifthly, That God's actual Discharge pronounced thus to Him, was not a general
actual Discharge in the Court of Heaven, and at the Tribunal of Publick Justice, that
all been wronged, to the Elect, by the Denomination and *Quatenus Elect*; though
they actually brought into the Conscience of this or that individual Elect Person,
Faith is wrought in them. If I say, he means these, or any of these, by being
actually Justified only when they Believe, then I must declare my Dissent from him;
besides what I have given already, am ready to give further Reasons for my
Dissent, if required by him, or any Body else: In the mean while I forbear to urge
further.

Page 5. He says Mr. Eyres, &c. seems to say, that neither God's Justice, nor his Holy
Law, doth charge Sin on any Elect Person, though under the Power of Unbelief, and Vile,
Propheane. I Answer,

By charging Sin upon the Person, he means,

1. The Condemning of Sin as Sin; We say, God's Justice, and Holy Law, Con-
demns Sin as Sin, wherever they find it, though it be found upon the Persons of Be-
lievers themselves, whose Persons most grant to be actually freed from Condemnation.

If by Charging Sin upon their Persons is intended, that whoever breaks the Law,

is a Breaker of the Law in his own Person; We say, That Believers themselves are in themselves found Transgressors of the Law, and break it daily, and come under the Guilt of its Breaches in themselves. And that therefore their Righteousness, that Answers the Demands of the Law, consists not in their own personal Obedience, either in whole, or in part, but in the Obedience of their Head and Surety. How much more do we say, That the Law does charge Sin upon the Elect in a State of Nature in this Sense?

3. We also Judge the Holy Law charges Sin upon the Person of the Elect Unbeliever, as he is considered in himself, in that relation his Person had to the first Adam on the bottom of the Covenant of Works. But we do not seem, but roundly say, That neither God's Justice, nor his Holy Law, can charge Sin upon the Person of such an one, as the Eye of Justice views him in another, in that relation he stands to his Surety, and that Covenant whose Conditions are perfectly fulfilled for him, by that Glorious Surety; for under such a consideration *his transgression is finished, his sin made an end of, reconciliation made for him, and an everlasting righteousness brought in to cover him*, Dan 9. 24. And who shall lay any thing to his charge? For 'tis God that Justifies; who shall condemn? It is Christ that died, nay rather, that is risen again, &c. Rom. 8. 34. 35.

4. We do also say, The Law does charge Sin upon their Consciences: For in every Execution there is a Charge pre-supposed: And whether the Conscience of an unconverted Sinner be under Security or Despair, 'tis a Law Execution there (as might be shewed at large) the one being more sensible, the other more insensible: And in this Sense the whole Man is charged with Sin by the Law, as he stands at the Bar of Conscience. But as the same Person stands at the Tribunal of Justice in the Court of Heaven, he cannot be there justly charged; for Justice has there received for him full Satisfaction, and given out to him a full Discharge by his Surety, about 1700 Years ago.

Thus have I also endeavoured to State this Question aright: I have no Call yet to Argue, 'till Opposition be made by the Prefacer, and others, to the Truth and thus distinguished.

The Reason the Prefacer gives for his Thoughts, concerning Mr. Eyres, and others is this; That Mr. Eyres had Asserted, Page 94, 95, 45. *That all the Elect before Conversion and Faith, stand actually Reconciled to God, and Justified afore Him*. In what Sense the Elect may be said then to be actually Justified, has been afore Explained. And Mr. Eyres has done it substantially in Page 94, 95, &c. His Explanation thereof himself might have been took by the Prefacer, if he pleased, and his Arguments Answered foot to foot (if he could, or else Silence, and not continued Acculation) has appeared most lovely in him. But to clear up Mr. Eyres meaning, That *they stand Actually Reconciled to God*, &c. 'Tis to be observed, That Reconciliation in Scripture is two-fold.

First, On God's part, towards the Elect Sinner. Second, On the Sinners part towards God.

The Former again is two-fold.

1. That Eternally in God's Breast, viz. His Electing Love: For if He loved with such a Love from Eternity, is was inconsistent with Hatred and Irreconciliation.

Obj. But he loved them from Eternity only with a love of good will; but not with a love of complacency.

Ans. 1. The distinction is not right. 2. If so, it would not invalidate the Argument.

1. The Distinction is not true: for according to the former Rules hinted about Distinction, the Members of the Distinction are not opposite; for the love of good will, (as Dr. Goodwin well proves) comprehends all in it, and therefore he chuses sometimes to call the latter the Love of Friendship, Commerce, or Communion. This Debate would be soon ended, if it was plainly stated, what is meant by this Love of Delight. By it must be meant, as far as I can judge,

1. God's Eternal Will to go forth by way of Union into the highest Creature-Communication. Or,

2. God's sight or vision from Eternity to Eternity, viewing the Persons of the Elect Number in Christ their Head compleat. Or,

3. God's accepting and delighting in the Approaches and Services of such Persons.

Or, 4. His manifesting himself to them, for to be enjoyed by them. Now therefore, If the first is intended, the Members of the Distinction are not lawfully opposite, the one being subordinate to the other, and included therein. For what is the Eternal Love of God towards a Person, but his Will to give all good to that Person he shall be capable of receiving? This is his Love of good Will. The principal Good he Decreed to give, was Himself in our Natures, for Eternal Communion, this call (if ye will) his Complacency towards their Persons; so that in willing to give all good, he willed to give himself in Christ, to be Eternally enjoyed. So that here is no difference, and therefore no ground for such a Distinction.

It distinguishes between God's Will and Prescience, which Distinction is good in it self, but ill-applied to this Matter; for 'tis false and Non-sense, to limit his Prescience, which is one Eternal View in Him, in which all things are from Eternity to Eternity, present to him, that he willed to be) to any time at all, but especially to limit them to the time of the Persons Believing. As if his glorious Knowledge of Vision never saw the Elect Sinner in his Son, afore the Sinner by Faith sees and apprehends it in his Conscience. But if,

4. 'Tis granted the Distinction is true, it being between Love, as it is an Affection in God, and the manifestation thereof in Time; or between the Decree and the Execution of the Decree; and the latter Branch thereof, well timed and limited to Conversion; but then the wording of it thus is very exceptionable: For,

1. Without a constant limitation, it confounds his Love, and the manifestation thereof.

2. It has a tendency to the understanding of the Hearer, to pare and parcel out the glorious Love of Election, and so depretiate it to the Minds of Multitudes; which to my grief I know to be practically true.

3. Most blasphemous Errors about Electing-Love have shrouded under the Distinction as thus worded, (which I know to be true too) and therefore would it not be more according to the plainness and simplicity of the Gospel to word it thus. God does not manifest his Love to Sinners but in a way of Believing; or, he never accepts and delights in their Approaches and Services afore Faith. Or, there can be no Communion had with him afore they Believe.

I am not soon persuaded to reject an old received Distinction or Expression, used by godly Men with a good intent; but when it is made use of to darken the Counsel of God, and becomes a Word without Knowledge; and when it is perverted to stumble the Weak, to confirm the Ignorant, to shelter Errors, and to darken Truth, 'tis time to reject it, especially this that is Anti-scriptural: The Scriptures of Truth affirm the contrary, *viz. That God declares himself well pleased with Elect Sinners before they have Faith.* It was the Sum of the Gospel the Angels Preached at the Incarnation of Christ, *Luke 2. 14. Glory to God on the Highest, Peace on Earth, good Will towards Men.* Good Will here is *εὐδοκία*, which is best rendred Well-pleasingness, Delight or Complacency: And so the Word is rendred by the same Translators, *Mat. 3. 17. This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.* 'Tis the same Word here as in *Luke*, only here 'tis a *Verb*, and in *Luke* a *Noun*. Other places might be added, but let this plain Proof suffice to evidence, that 'tis an Un-truth against the very Letter of the Scripture, to lay, *That God loves not his Children afore Conversion, with a Love of Complacency*, when the Angels at Christ's Incarnation, in their Heavenly Anthems, warbled it forth, and when the Father himself declared it towards our Head and Surety, at his Baptism, *Mat. 3. 17.* and Consummately at his Resurrection: And whatever he declared to his Son, as the Surety of the Election, the same, at the same time, he declared to the Election in him.

Thus have I proved this Distinction, as commonly used, to be faulty; but yet if it were admitted, and take but along with it the Sense, wherein several that use it hold, Electing Love from Eternity towards the Persons of the chosen Ones, it would not rebate the edge of the Argument in the least, *viz. That* whomsoever God loved with such a Love from Eternity in his own Breast, he could not possible hate, and be reconciled unto them; but 'tis true, (past all sober contradiction) Reconciliation on his part was in his blessed Mind to them from all Eternity.

2. The Second Branch of the Distinction is God's Act in declaring and manifesting his Reconciliation to them, which again is two-fold.

1. Reconciliation declared to them in general, by their Surety, when he had perfectly fulfilled all Covenant Conditions in their room and stead, *Isa. 59. ult. 2 Cor. 5. 19. Dan. 9. 24.*

2. When 'tis declared to, and revealed through the Organ of Faith to the Conscience of a Sinner, *Eph. 5. 8, 9. Rom. 5. 11.*

All this may be fitly called *Actual Reconciliation* on God's part. But,

Secondly, There is in the Scriptures a Reconciliation said to be on our part. And here, pray observe, that the Scripture-Dialect bends most this way, to shew that God has Reconciled Sinners to himself, and not himself to Sinners, as might be manifested at large, if Brevity were not intended. But,

This Distinction on our part may be also distinguished into that, that's Radical and Fundamental, *viz. in our Root and Head, 2 Cor. 5. 19. Rom. 5. 10.* which consists in the actual Atonement we made in our Surety at his death. Or,

2. That which on our part is actual in our Consciences, *viz. When we are made by Grace to lay aside our Enmity in part against our blessed God and Father, 2 Cor. 5. 20.* To be sure this cannot be, 'till Faith is wrought in the Heart, *Rom. 5. 1.*

Now 'tis evident that Mr. Eyles means that which is on God's part actually declared at the Resurrection of Jesus Christ, even that actual Reconciliation obtained by the

compleat

complete Satisfaction of our Surety; (as Dr. Twisse proves against *Arminius* very substantially;) and therefore his words cannot be tortured and wrested to another meaning, without breach of Christian Love.

The same Answer may suffice to what is Excepted against some Passages of his, in *Page 46.* *That the Elect were thus freed, delivered, made complear, &c. in Christ their Surety and Representative, and Justified in that attual Justification He received for them, and in their stead, though they receive it not into their Consciences till Faith.*

What follows in the Preface, *Page 6.* to explain the Prefacer's meaning, I approve: And were it not for those odious Consequences he has insinuated to spring from Mr. *Eyres's* Notions, (who has so accurately, solidly, and plainly delivered his Judgment about the timing of *Justification*) I should in that Explanatory Instance of his, have given him the right Hand of Fellowship, and so have ended the Debate.

But the Absurdities he pretends to fix, favour not of a Christian Spirit, which moves me a little to review them. Our Notion of *Eternal Justification* at the time of Christ's Resurrection, and by Faith have been so plainly opened and stated, that to the godly Wife it would be a superfluous thing to vouchsafe a particular Examination of his wild Consequences; they can easily see they are all nothing to the purpose. But for the sake of weak ones (who judge that enough is said to a Position that suits with their dark Minds) when nothing is said at all to any good purpose: And (when no Answer is given to a Fallacious Argument, they judge it cannot be Answered) I shall enter upon an Examination of those Absurdities, he alledges, follow from our Notion of *Justification*.

The first Absurdity charged is,

1. That it confounds (1.) *Election* and *Justification*. (2.) The Decree, and the Execution of the Decree.

Ans. Both these have been Answered already; but as to First, to what has been already said, I shall subjoyn Mr. *Eyres's* Answer in his own Words, *Page 92.* saith he, *they may be both of them Immanent Eternal Acts, and yet not confounded. Indeed all different Immanent Acts are but one simple Act in God, in whose Decrees there is no Priority or Posteriority, quoting Hilary, Omnia, &c. — Yet in our consideration they receive sufficient distinction from their various Objects, and our various Application of them. And Election and Justification are distinguished; Election includes both the end, which is the Will of God's Grace, and all the Means, from the beginning to the end, conducing thereto. His Will not to Punish includes, precisely and formally, only some part of the means.*

To the Second he may remember what has been Alledged, That 'tis not confounding the Decree and Execution, viz. his Secret and Revealed Will, to call them by the same Name.

2. If to Constitute Righteous be Essential to God's Justifying a Sinner (as has been proved) as well as pronouncing him Righteous. There the one belongs to the Decree, and the other to the Execution, and are not Confounded: For to Constitute Righteous, and to Pronounce Righteous, are two distinct things, and do differ as *Eternal Election* and *Temporary Election* do. And as in *Election Eternal* and *Temporary*, there is no Confusion of the Decree, and the Execution thereof; so 'tis in *Eternal Justification*, and *Justification in Time*.

Justification, as being the thing willed, is two-fold:

1. The same God Acting as one in Essence Decretively, in the same Act of Eternity, acting subsistentially, passes the Decree into a Covenant Transaction, between the Father and the Son, with the whole Election, his Seed considered in him: In which Covenant the Father Promised to the whole Election, *John* 1. 2. by their Head set up from Everlasting, *Prov.* 8. 22. Justification of Life. This Covenant Transaction is under some Considerations, the Effect of the Decree, and therefore the thing willed as it was in Eternity.

2. The thing willed is in time, viz. An Act passed to the whole Election by Christ their Surety, *Rom.* 8. 34. when raised from the dead, *Rom.* 6. ult. And this Act also terminated on their Consciences in Believing. Now there is a difference between God's Act of Willing in Eternity, and the first Effect of *Sovereign Pleasure*, viz. *Covenant Transaction* between the blessed Persons in Eternity. 1. The first being an Act of God considered as one in Essence. The 2d. an Act of God considered as Three, in the manner of subsisting, or Three Persons. 2. The one is a Decree, the other really a Covenant. 3. The former advances his Love and Sovereignty, the latter, together therewith, his Faithfulness and Truth. 4. This Act under the former Consideration, sets up an everlasting Mediator; but under the latter Consideration supposes him as set up already; so that where there is such material ground for Distinguishing, there can be no confusion.

Again, there is a difference between *res voluta* in Eternity, even in the *Eternal Compact*, and *res voluta* in Time; even this Eternal Covenant promulgated divers ways, and at sundry times, but consummately in the publick, visible Transaction, between the Father and Jesus Christ (actually existing in our Natures in the fulness of Time) even from the Cradle to the Throne of the Majesty on High. 1. The one is an Act *Secret*, the other *Revealed*. 2. The one *Eternal*, the other *Temporal*; so that besides the Decree being Eternal, the thing decreed, in a sense, is proved to be Eternal, and differs from the manifestative Execution in Time. So that 'tis plain, the Assertion of *Justification in the Eternal Compact*, does not confound the Decree, and the Execution thereof. This Absurdity of the *Prefacer* seems to have most weight in it of all his fixteen, therefore I have repeated and urged anew, what Answers were cast in interperetedly afore. His

Second is — *Then the Elect never fell in the first Adam, &c.* 'Tis intended for an Hypothetick *Syllogism*; and thus it should run. If the Elect fell in the first Adam, and there was a time when they were under the guilt of Sin, and were Children of Wrath, then they were not Actually Justified from Eternity; but the former is true, and therefore the latter. To which I Answer:

1. The *Syllogism* is false. For from affirming the Antecedent, it proceeds to deny the Consequent. And in all *Hypothetick Syllogisms* that concludes Negatively; the Rule is, *To advance from denying the Antecedent, to deny the Consequent, and the contrary thereto is faulty*: so is this *Syllogism* of our Antagonists.

2. The *Connexion* is false; 'tis a meer *non sequitur*. It should have been a particular Negative Branch of an Universal Negative; but 'tis not so. That which is understood by Justification from Eternity, is distinct from what is intended by Justification in Time. And so *Non-Justification* from Eternity is distinct from that which is *Non-Justification* in Time. The former is Reprobation, the latter is God's Judicial Sentence of Condemnation. And the former of both is not comprehended under the latter

atter of both. But enough of this. 'Tis my Duty to make it plain to the Capacities of all God's Children, if the Spirit strikes in with it. Let the *Godly Reader* know, That we hold not the Actual Existence of the Creature from Eternity; nor that the Election, as actually Existing, was actually guilty of the Breaches of a published Law; nor that the Blessed Mediator had, as existing in our Flesh, actually, publickly, and visibly performed Covenant Conditions for them; nor that they had received an actual Discharge into their Consciences, for all these Tenents we abhor: But only, that God's Eternal Imputation of Righteousness to them, was an Act of God; therefore no need to load us with such direful Consequences. And unless they can prove these to be our Principles, their *Consequences* are to no purpose, but meer forged slanders cast upon Persons and Truths. I cannot but think they know in their Consciences we hold no such Principles; and how they will acquit themselves of throwing *Calumnies* upon the Truth and Us, will be known one Day. But to repeat again our *Sentiments concerning Eternal Justification*. It is an Act of God's Sovereign Pleasure, constituting Persons Righteous in the Righteousness of another, and Eternally Promising to the Lord Redeemer, a Discharge to them every manner of way, upon his Engagement to perform Covenant Conditions perfectly for them. Now let the Impartial Reader Judge, whether it can follow from these Principles, That the Elect must not fall in *Adam*? No, but the quite contrary; for,

1. This Sovereign Will, and Compact of God, that unalterably fixes the end, fixes all the Means conducing thereunto; and this is one of the principal Means, that they should of themselves lose their own personal Righteousness in *Adam* their Head, that so they might be alone compleatly Righteous in the Righteousness of a Redeemer.

2. So far as they are to be understood to have a Representative-being in their everlasting Head, so far as considered in Him they were never otherwise than Righteous. And this hinders not, but in that relation they had to *Adam* their Head, since the Fall, they are Guilty and Unrighteous: since Believers themselves, here, as in Christ have no *Condemnation*: As considered in themselves, or *Adam* their Root, have the *Sentence of Death and Condemnation*.

Thirdly, His Third Consequence is this, *viz. That Actual Justification is not, cannot be the Declaring, Pronouncing, &c.*

The force of his Argument lies here, *viz. That Actual Justification is only the Declaring and Pronouncing an ungodly, guilty, and condemned Sinner, Just and Righteous through Christ's Righteousness*: Therefore there cannot be in any Sense *Actual Justification from Eternity*. Whereunto I thus Reply:

1. That there is a *Justification from Eternity*, which he here grants.

2. But he would not have it Actual: If by Actual he means an Actual Discharge in the Conscience, and an Actual Conformity (in measure) to Christ's Resurrection, I am of his Mind. But if he means it in reference to God, the *Sentence conceived in God's Mind*, (as Dr. Ames says) *from Eternity was Actual, it being an Act of God*. And when we speak of Justification Analogously, 'tis generally understood of God's Act; and of that Act which the Scriptures call *counting Sinners Righteous in the Righteousness of another*, which is indeed an Act of his blessed Mind. And therefore I know not why Persons should be offended at the Word *Actual Justification from Eternity*. For if there was any Justification at all from Eternity, it was only God's Act in his own Decree, and therefore could not be any thing but Actual.

Fourthly,

Fourthly, His Fourth Consequence is, That by this Notion the Elect are twice Justified, &c. And it makes a posterior and collateral Act in God.

It runs thus: There is no posterior or collateral Act in God, therefore there can be no Actual Justification from Eternity.

Ans. 1. What we mean by *Actual*, has been already Explained. 2. But I know not what he means precisely, (1.) by Posterior or Collateral Acts: And (2.) by joining them both together in his Argument. 3. We make Justification, as it is an Act in God, to be one continued unchangeable Act from Eternity, which appears to be a plain Consequence from our Positions. 'Tis this very thing makes us contend for Justification from Eternity, because Justification really is fundamentally an Act of God's Mind, and all Acts of his Mind are Eternal and Unchangeable. The blasphemous Inferences of Acts arising *de novo* in God's Mind, towards *Elect Sinners*, we endeavour to Fence against, by Asserting *Eternal Justification*. And the Position, as we hold it, effectually destroys them; and yet must the Principle be accused of countenancing and indulging those horrid things 'tis directly shaped to oppose and quash?

4. *Justification* from Eternity, and *Justification* at the Resurrection of Christ, differ but as God's Secret and Revealed Will does; and there is no other Distinction between them. God's Secret and Revealed Will are not two Acts in God; his Revealed Will is but the Declaration of the Acts of his Mind; and that Act is but one and the same with the Act of his Mind: *An Acquittance in the Heart of the Creditor, and in a Paper. A Pardon in the Heart of a Prince, and Enrolled (as Mr. Eyres well says) is one and the same; this Manifested; and the other Secret.*

5. *Justification pronounced* may be at sundry times, and in divers manners, and yet but one and the same Act. And as Mr. Eyres adds, *Page 105*. Though there are never so many Copies written forth in several Hands, they do not make many Acquittances, or many Pardons, being but the Transcripts of one Original. And though God's Love in his Breast, and this Love as testified divers ways and times, both in Old and New Testament, multiplies not Acts of Love in God, but is one and the same Act of Love in Him. The same may be said of Justification as it is an Act of God's Secret Will, and as it is an Act of his Revealed Will, and as Revealed at various Seasons, and in variety of ways. Good Men, counted Sound, Pious, Learned and Intelligent, have differed among themselves in ascribing Justification to several Periods, yet for the most part Judged not one another *Antinomian*: Nor this Inference just and lawful from thence, *viz. There are posterior Acts in God. Alsted, Pemble, Twisse, Rutherford, Ames, Eyres, Crandon, &c.* Judged that God's Eternal Act, *viz. Actus volendi*, might properly enough be termed Justification, and yet denied not all the various Acts of his Revealed Will.

The rest, that limits Justification to an Act of his Revealed Will, yet have vastly differed as to the Timing of it: *Macovius* judges it to be then, when the first Promise of Grace was given forth to *Adam* and *Eve*.

Dr. Goodwin, though he says we are Virtually Justified in Christ, in respect of our Consciences, yet he asserts, That Christ as the Sinners Surety, took out at his Resurrection, a real, actual, formal Discharge, in his own Name, and the Name of the whole Election; which is that great Original Discharge they receive into their Consciences in Believing. According to him 'tis in Christ actually as a Root; and it follows, if the Life of a Tree be actually in the Root, that Tree may properly enough be said

ified, &c.
re can be

I know
by joy-
s an Act
s to be a
tend for
an Act of
blasphemy
endea-
we hold
enhancing

ft, differ
between
ed Will
the same
a Paper,
e and the

and yet
here are
Acquit-
though
n in Old
ame Act
s Secret
Seasons,
elligent,
t for the
d lawful
herford,
might
cts of his

e vastly
Promise
t of our
Resur-
of the
Consci-
follows,
be said

be actually alive. If I mistake not; *Witsius* compounds both together; alledging, that Justification was initially in that Promise, diversly afterwards, with gradual means declared; but consummately at Christ's Resurrection. Dr. *Crisp* times it to the first actual Being of the *Elected Sinner*. Dr. *Burgesse* periods it first at *Infant Baptism*, which he affirms is an Initial Justification at the Tribunal of Christ in his Church; and he makes his Initial to mean little less than our Actual: And indeed, it can be no less than an Act of Christ Ministerially by his Church; according to that, *Mat. 18. 18. Whomsoever ye loose on Earth shall be loosed in Heaven*. If this Church Act Ministerially be not founded upon an *Antecedent Act* of God, published concerning the Act of the Godly *Indefinitely*; 'tis altogether *insignificant*. I confess, they that are not for *Infant-Baptism*, are not so much girt by this, as they that are for it. However, he speaks for his Opinion the Primitive Fathers, the Confessions of the Reformed Churches, the Protestant Divines abroad of the chiefest Note, and the most Eminent at home, and lastly, the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, Established by Law; so that they need be Silent as well as others.

Others again have fixed the Timing immediately afore Faith, in order of Nature, though not of Time. Mr. *Cotton*, quoted by Dr. *Chauncy*, to whom seem to agree, *Calvin, Luther, Austin, Mr. Walker, &c.* And what if there be some that give its first Period to the Infused Principle, rather than Act of Faith. But lastly, several affirm, That Justification is after Faith.

And after all, it might be no hard task to reconcile all these Opinions, and shew that Truth there was in each of them, depending like Links in a Chain one upon another. But my design in reciting these, is to shew the different Opinions of Men, generally counted very sound, about the Timing of Justification. And that 'tis to be thought no *understanding godly Person* will say, That these made divers Acts, or Posters, or Collateral Acts in God of Justification.

The godly Reader may see this Objection fully *Answered* by Mr. *Eyres*, Page 105, 106. And yet the *Prefacer* throws it in again, without taking any notice of Mr. *Eyres's* Arguments to overthrow it; either because he would say something, or because he thinks any thing said on this Subject will pass as current Reason: But this is not to answer Mr. *Eyres*, but a resolution to have the last Word of him. And so he, and them of his Kidney, may easily have of us, for were we fond of drawing the Saw of Conscience meerly for the sake of the last Word, we have neither Leisure nor Money to do so. But I pass on to his next.

Fifthly, His Fifth is rather a new Charge than one in the Catalogue of Absurdities; which 'tis propounded (as by one of late in a publick Debate) for the sake of another consequence in its belly: But, however, this is my Answer:

1. That the *Protestants* have made a Distinction formerly, between Faith Justifying, and being Justified by Faith; or between Faith which Justifies, and Faith whereby we are Justified. But let it pass, as he words it, with a candid Construction. Faith justifies, or we are Justified by Faith, must be understood properly, or improperly: improperly, or by a *Metonymy*, then the meaning is the Object of Faith Justifies; and in this Sense we abhor to say, *Faith only Justifies declaratively*; for so taken it Justifies materially, &c.

2. If Faith be understood in a proper Sense, 'tis in reference to 1. Its Habit. 2. Its Act. Or, 3. Both. If Faith Justifies properly in reference to its Habit, it can be no other than a Supernatural Light of Life, going along with the Object manifesting or his Divine Beam, as forming its own Image within, and so impress upon the Soul. And take it in the latter Sense (which is most congruous to an inward Principle) you still I would fain know, what is it but a Divine Living Light infused there, which both Light and Eye conveyed by the applied Object, suited to view the Object as precious, for the Manifestation or Declaration of it self? And again, what is this Object but God's Justifying Act through Christ, and his Righteousness? That the Object of Justification is such, is taken for granted; being not the Matter in Controversie. That the infused Principle of Faith is an impressed Light of Life, manifesting the Object to the blind Soul, to be suitable, precious, and excellent, is as plain and evident from the Scriptures of Truth. The Holy Scriptures do attest, 1. That God the Father is working this inward Principle, did it by Discovering or Revealing. *Mat. 11. 25. And thou hast revealed them unto Babes.* Add hereto *Mat. 16. 17.* And that this is not bare outward, but inward Revelation, appears by comparing these places with *Gal. 16.* — *To reveal his Son in me.* Which Expressions do evidently declare, what the Father does in Infusing the Principle of Faith.

2. They do set forth, That the Second Person, as He Co-operates in this Infusion in the Principle of Faith, does it by Revealing, Declaring, Discovering, &c. See *Mat. 11. 27.* and other places.

3. They evince, That the Spirit, as the immediate Efficient, works this inward Principle, by Revealing or Discovering, &c. *John 15. 26.* — *Chap. 16. ver. 14, 15.* *John 5. 8.*

4. They also bear witness, That the Gospel Preached, as the principal, external instrumental means, operates also by Revealing, *Rom. 1. 16, 17.* I might add more but let these suffice, which I draw up into this Argument. If all Causes that concur to produce the inward Principle of Faith, according to the Scripture, be said to operate by Revealing, Declaring, or Words of the very same import, then it follows That Faith, if it may be said to Justify as an infused Principle, can Justify no other wise but declaratively, &c.

But the former is true (as has been already manifested) and therefore the latter.

To which I subjoin one Argument more: If the proper effect of such Causes be set forth in Scripture Language by Manifestation, Declaration, or Words of the same Signification, *i. e.* If the Infused Principle of Faith be expressed by no other Word in the Book of God than Manifestation, Declaration, &c. or Words of the very same Import, then Faith, if it Justifies properly as a Principle or Habit, can Justify no otherwise than Declaratively, &c. But the Former is true, (and I Challenge him, or any body else, to produce me a Scriptural Instance to the contrary) therefore the Latter. So these contemptible Men may with Boldness say, That Faith in this respect only Justifies declaratively in the Conscience. Yet,

2. If Faith be taken in a proper Sense for the Act of Faith, whether that more inwardly sensible and secret, or that more sensible and perceivable, it must either Justify, 1. Conditionally; or, 2. Manifestatively and Declaratively in the Conscience. If conditionally, it infers a new Remedial Law of Grace; and if it Justifies as a condition of that it Justifies as a Work. I have no Call here to enlarge at present on this, That Faith

not conditionally, it being not my Antagonist's Assertion, nor the Matter of the present Debate between him and I. And besides, it would be but to act that Matter over again, that has been done fully and Learnedly, by the Reverend and Learned Dr. Chauncy, in his Answer to Mr. Williams, and Learned Mr. Eyles, in his Book lately Printed, Page 128. to Page 145. which the Reader may peruse. Therefore 'tis sufficient for me here to take the Prefacer's grant, viz. That Faith Justifies not conditionally; and thence to conclude upon him, therefore Faith is taken properly (as to the Act) Justifies Declaratively, Manifestly, &c. in the Conscience.

But he, and others with him, I know will reply, That there is a Third Thing, viz. That Faith Justifies instrumentally. To which I Answer,

1. That Instrumental Causes subserve their principal Efficient two ways, either *ad esse rei*, or *ad esse effectus*, i. e. either in producing things, or in effecting the knowledge of a thing already produced. In the former Sense the Sword has an efficient Concurrence with the Hand that wields it, in assisting a Person: The Trowel, Saw and Axe, with the Builder, in setting up an House, &c. In the latter Sense I do deny that Faith Justifies Instrumentally. For then,

1. It would effect and produce Justification by a way of concurrent Causality with God himself: And therefore,

2. It would yet have a greater hand in the business of Justification, than as a Condition, in the Sense held by many. And,

3. There would be no avoiding the force of Mr. Br's Argument, viz. If Faith Justifies Instrumentally, 'tis either as God's Instrument or Man's; if as God's, then it must follow, That 'tis God believes Justifying a Sinner. If as Man's, then Man Justifies himself, and not God; both which are horrible Absurdities.

4. Faith has no manner of Causality in producing Justification it's Object, as it is God's Act, whether be that Gracious Sentence, *first* as conceived in his Mind from Eternity: Or, *secondly*, as Pronounced to Christ, the Sinner's Surety, at his Resurrection: Or, *thirdly*, as this Act is terminated on the Sinner's Conscience. For the Act of God, as qualified in the last Sense, is the Object Faith lays hold on; and therefore must be in order of Nature compleat afore the Act; and the conversant Act adds nothing to the compleatness of the Object. Nor, *secondly*, has it any Causality in producing the Matter of our Justification, as that is the compleat Performance of Covenant Conditions, upon which compleat Performance of Covenant Conditions, the Justifying of God Judicially passes; which compleat Performance, &c. as engaging such a Justifying Act at the Tribunal of Justice, was done by Christ our Surety, many hundred Years ago; and therefore the Sinner's Faith can add nothing to the Being of Justification. So that Justification, the Object of Faith, cannot have the least Instrumentally from Faith, to effect or Produce its being. Whence conclude, Faith does not, cannot Justify instrumentally, as an Instrument, subserving to the being of the thing, at least in an Active Sense.

Therefore it follows, (for there is no Third) That it Instrumentally Justifies, as it subserves *ad esse rei*, that is, as it is a Conscience Instrument, whereby the Conscience receives God's Gracious Sentence of Absolution, pronounced heretofore to Christ, as his Surety, and now manifested in the Conscience, and comes to the practical Knowledge and Persuasion thereof to its self. Mr. Rutherford will allow it to be set forth by the Similitude of an Hand taking a thing nearer to it self, that is at a distance; but of an Hand that only receives the Gift put into it, which Hand is given and opened to receive at the same time by the same Giver. Says he, *Illud natari velim*, &c. *I would have this considered, That Faith does not Instrumentally make the Eternal Remission of Sin, as an immanent Act, but sup- pliciter, as it is done already.*

Again, *Non quod Fides*, &c. viz. *Not that Faith by any Instrumental Causality produces Christi's Righteousness, or by any real Act Attracts the Righteousness of Christ, &c.* whence does emerge a

5th Reason. That no Act makes its Object, but is compleat afore the Act is put forth: Therefore Justification, as 'tis the Object of Justifying Faith, cannot in the least be Instrumentally Effected by Faith it self.

6thly, and Lastly, No Creature can Justify but declaratively. Faith, though a Grace, yet is but a creature, and therefore can Justify no otherwise. The Proposition is plain from Scripture, *'Tis God that Justifies* in a proper Sense, Rom. 8. 33. 'Tis a Prerogative that the Supream Judge has reserved to Himself, *That He might be Just*, and the Justifier of him that Believes in Jesus, Rom. 3. 26. The Jews counted it Blasphemy in Christ to forgive Sin by his proper Authority, Esteeming Him to be a meer Man, Mark 2. 7. And had He been but a meer Man, they were in the right; for it is founded on that undeniable Maxim, *Who can forgive sins but God only?* Mark 2. 7. And that Max-

ime warranted from that Portion of Scripture, *Iſa.* 43. 25. The Assumption is most true. That Faith in us, though an excellent Grace, is yet but a Creature; and it would sound harsh, to say Faith forgives Sins; Faith imputes Righteousness, or Faith justifies no other than declaratively: As a Church may be said to remit Sin; but 'tis only ministerially and declaratively. Therefore 'tis undeniable, that Faith justifying as an Instrument, justifies only evidentially, *Heb.* 11. 1. I have proved it, and can no other way do it. That 'tis only an Instrument, *ad nōsse*, and not *ad esse rei*. 'Tis the Instrument of the awakened Conscience, whereby it receives and records Gods justifying Act to the Conscience, through Jesus Christ and his Righteousness. I grant indeed, that Faith is the Instrument of Justification: But such an Instrument as Calvin asserts, *Inf.* l. 3. ch. 2. viz. *A firm and certain Knowledge of the Mercy of God towards us, founded upon the Truth of the free Promise in Christ, which is revealed in our Minds by the Holy Spirit, and sealed in our Hearts.* And such as Dr. Chauncy defines, viz. *A spiritual Organ in a quickened Sinner, whereby he sees, tastes, and feelingly lays hold on Christ and his Righteousness for Justification;* i. e. He sensibly and practically is made to know God's justifying Act to be passed to him in Christ his Surety, upon the account of that Righteousness his Surety performed. *Chaun. Cat.* page 232.

I might multiply in what Sense the first Reformers took Faith as an Instrument; to wit, An Instrument wrought by the Spirit in an awakened, quickened Conscience; whereby under the Sense of villainess and Condemnation in it self, it receives the glad-tydings of great Joy; viz. That God counts and declares him guiltless and righteous in the Righteousness of Jesus. I further prove from the Scriptural Expressions that define Faith, that 'tis Instrumental to the Conscience-Knowledge of Justification, as it is it's Object. (1.) Conscience-Justification is opposed to the Conscience-Knowledge of Sin, *Rom.* 3. 20, &c. And thus I argue Conscience-Justification; which is by Faith opposite to the Conscience-Condemnation, which is by the Law. Conscience-Condemnation, which is by the Law is the Knowledge of Sin; or the practical Conscience-Knowledge in a Man, that he is sinful, guilty and unrighteousness, as in the first Adam and under the first Covenant. Therefore on the contrary, that Conscience-Justification is a Knowledge in the Conscience of imputed Righteousness, and it's being counted righteous and discharged therein. 'Tis the Apostles own Syllogism, as in the fore-mentioned Place, as the godly Learned may easily perceive. (2.) 'Tis set forth by the Word *Knowledge*, in other Places. *Iſa.* 53. 11. *Iohn* 4. 10. 1 *Cor.* 2. 2, 12. *Heb.* 8. 11. 1 *Iohn* 3. 2. Ch. 4. 6, 16. Ch. 5. 13, 19, 20. But I grant, 'tis not an Head, but a Conscience-Knowledge, 1 *Iohn* 5. 10. Not a bare Knowledge of the Object; but of the Object, as suited to my Necessities. And, 2. Not of this Object for others only, but for me also; and this founded upon the Truth of the Promise of Grace in Christ infinitely free; and therefore 'tis not a Knowledge only, that enlightens the Understanding; but that establishes the Heart, you have both these in *Iohn* 3. 19. Hence also explained by Confidence, or a fiducially Recumbency; which is the Souls trusting to this Righteousness as it's own for Acceptance, and therefore upon the account of his going to God with boldness, *Heb.* 4. 16. ch. 10. 22.

3. Faith in the Scriptures is defined, *The Evidence of things not seen*, viz. God's justifying Act passed to the Soul in Christ and his Righteousness. The Word signifies a convincing Demonstration, viz. to the Conscience, of *things not seen*, viz. of the *Righteousness* and Strength that is in Christ; not by Reason understood, nor sensibly felt to be in me, but evidenced by Faith; as this Righteousness is mine in Christ. 'Tis not the only and Supream Evidence, for there are others; and the Spirit of God is Supream, *Rom.* 8. 16. 'Tis not the revealing, but receiving Evidence, 1 *Iohn* 1. 12. The Spirit reveal to Faith, that receives. *The Spirit witnesseth with our Spirit*, i. e. our Grace of Faith or first Fruit of the Spirit in us. The Sun, Day, and Window may be said to enlighten the Room in divers respects. The Sun lightens by affording Light, the Window by receiving Light; thus the Spirit justifies in the Conscience, by manifesting God's Act unto, and upon him, Faith by receiving this Manifestation, and applying it to the Conscience, *Rom.* 3. 22.

4. Faith as Justifying, is set forth in Scriptures, by a Witness, or Testimony, or Record (being in the Original the same Word) *Iohn* 3. 33. 1 *Cor.* 1. 6. 2 *Thes.* 1. 10. *Heb.* 11. 4. But, (1.) Such a Witness as is in the Soul and Conscience, 1 *Iohn* 5. 10. 1 *Cor.* 1. 6. *Gal.* 1. 16. (2.) A Judicial Act to the Sinner arraigned at the Bar of Conscience. 'Tis a Court-Record brought down by the Spirit, from the Court of Justice in Heaven to the Court of Justice in the Conscience, (like the White Stone of Old given to the arraigned Person, as token of his Acquittal from the Judges;) that there is Justification of Life in Christ, *Rom.* 8. 1 *Iohn* 5. 10, 11. And this Record as received in the Conscience, honours God, by setting Seal to the Truth of his Declaration, *Iohn* 3. 33. So that Faith engrosses this Record in the Rolls of Conscience.

5. Faith is filled by the Holy Ghost, Manifestation, Revelation, Declaration, *Iohn* 14. 21. *Eph.* 1.

17. Rom. 3. 25. *John* 17. 16. *Rom.* 1. 16. But (1.) 'Tis such a Manifestation, Revelation, or Declaration, as is inward and practical in and to the Conscience, 2 *Cor.* 4. 2. *Gal.* 1. 16. *Rom.* 1. 16. (2.) Such a Manifestation, &c. as manifests, declares, and reveals, the blessed Object Reconciliation and Righteousness already prepared and suited in Christ, a Root and Surety to the Poor Sinner savingly seeing, that he is guilty and unrighteous in himself and the first *Adam*, and cannot be otherwise therefore, *Isa.* 45. 24. 2 *Cor.* 5. 19. *Mar.* 22. 4. And (3.) Not a revealing, but a receiving Manifestation (as before distinguished in the Notion of Evidence; it reveals, manifests, &c. not as the Sun or Day let's in Light to a Room; but as the Window that takes it in, or the Eye, that let's in the Object to the Brain to affect the Fancy. Therefore in a proper Sense, 'tis only instrumental to the Practical and Applicatory Knowledge of Justification in the Conscience. Hence

6. Faith is termed acknowledging the Son, 1 *John* 2. 23. *Eph.* 1. 17. 2 *Tim.* 2. 25. compare this with *John* 8. 32. which further confirms Faith to be the Instrument of the quickened Conscience, *ad nosse rei.*

7. Faith is set forth in Scripture, as a Holy Confidence in the Conscience, or Assurance, which must amount to this, that there is such Grace in Christ, and 'tis for me; *Isa.* 32. 17. 1 *The.* 1. 5. *Heb.* 10. 12. 1 *John* 3. 19. *Heb.* 3. 6, 14. ch. 10. 35, &c. But more of this hereafter.

8. Faith in the Word of God is called Persuasion, *Rom.* 4. 21. ch. 8. 38. 1 *John* 3. 19. (where 'tis in the Original, *persuade our Hearts before him.*) But it must be a Conscience-Persuasion of the reality of the Object, viz. his Christ, and his Grace, and that in reference to me, which also evinces Faith to be only an Instrument to subserve to the practical Conscience-Knowledge of Justification.

9. The proper Nature of an Act of Faith is expressed by the Spirit of God by the Term, *Receiving*, *John* 1. 12. *Rom.* 5. 17. whence I consider, (1.) That this receiving is an Act of the Soul or Conscience; 'tis not an outward Receiving, as of the Hand; but a Conscience receiving. (2.) The Act is appropriated to the Object. The Object is God's gracious Act, of counting and accepting Sinners righteous in another's Righteousness as declared; which is the Report of the Gospel, the glad-tidings of great joy. Faith therefore, as conversant about this Object must believe, and that for itself the glad-tidings. To believe a Report for my self, is to know that for Truth in reference to me; that I knew not afore, and this must affect my Conscience; if it removes guilt and makes it free, for 'tis Knowledge of Self, Pardon and Condemnation (which really affects the Conscience) is the fore, that the Plaster of free Justification is provided for. If therefore the Scriptures of Truth, thus define and explain Faith, as been afore-mentioned and proved; then it undeniable follows, that Faith is instrumental not to the *esse*, but *nosse* of Justification, as 'tis the Object of Faith. 'Tis true, I grant.

1. That according to the Scripture Language, oftentimes things are said to be, when they appear to be. As God is said to Love, when he does manifest his Love as afore-proved. So that in this Sense Faith may be said to give a being to Justification instrumentally; when in the Conscience it makes it appear to be: And in this respect, Justification cannot be said by any Means to be afore Faith: But according to this, Persons are then said to be justified in God's sight, when they know they are. So *Gen.*

2. That Faith as it instrumentally conduces to the *nosse* of Justification; so as it is God's Act, so to the *bene esse* or well being of it in reference to the Conscience, as the latter is the Fruit or Effect of the former. Know then, that Justification according to Divines is either Active or Passive. 1. Active is God's Sentence of Absolution conceived Eternally in his Mind, pronounced to Christ's the Sinner's Surety terminated on his Conscience in believing. 2. Passive is the Effect of this-upon the Soul, whereby the Person is made actually conformable to the Resurrection of Christ in some measure, *Rom.* 6. *Phil.* 3. 11. God's first judicial Act towards Christ our Surety as a Judge, was rolling away the Tomb-stone; to which he conforms us, by removing the Coercive Power of the Law off of the Conscience, by which we were irresistibly forced to bring our own personal Obedience for our Justification in a natural State, *John.* 7. ver. 1. to the 5th. which is opening the Prison Doors. 2. He took off the Grave-Cloaths that bound him: To which we are conformed by breaking the force of the Guilt and Reign of Sin in the Soul in some measure. 3. He quickened him (which should indeed have been first,) hereunto he makes us like him infusing spiritual Life into our Souls, *Ezek.* 16. 6. 4. He brought him out of the Grave; to this he conforms us, by translating of us out of a State of doing for Life, to belief for Life, *Col.* 1. 13. The Sum of all is, That by all these Acts, an actual discharge was given him as our Surety, *Rom.* 4. 1 *Cor.* 15. 14, 17. Herein we are conformed in the actual discharge wrought and effected in our Consciences; we being therein quickened, brought under Grace, made to believe, and the Guilt and Reign of Sin removed from our Consciences. Hence followed, 6. God the Father making him to

A Vindication of the Doctrine of

ascend to Heaven in Triumph, *Psal.* 68. 18. &c. welcoming him there, *Psal.* 110. 1. *Setting Him to sit down on the Throne of the Majesty on High, for ever to intercede,* *Psal.* 110. 1. *Heb.* 1. 3. *Heb.* 7. 25. 1. *Folr.* 2. 1. to which he conforms us, by causing us to rejoice and triumph over Sin and Satan, in the Righteousness of Jesus, *1 Cor.* 1. 29, 30, 31. to the end. And giving us the Privilege and Boldness of near approaching, and access to him, as dear Children to a beloved Father. through the Blood, Purity, and Obedience of his Son, in Acts of Holy Fellowship, with Prayer and Praise, *John* 1. 12. *Eph.* 2. 18. *Heb.* 10. 19. to the twenty third Chapter, *Heb.* 12. 22. to the twenty fifth Chapter. 4. 16. This Justification differs much from the other: For, 1. This is Passive; the other truly Active, according to sound Divines. 2. This is improperly so called; the other most properly. 3. The former alone is the Adequate Object of Justifying Faith, viz. God's Gracious Act, through the Redemption of Christ Jesus, however diversify'd: The latter only the Product thereof. 4. Though infused Light be the Fruit of Justification in the Court of Heaven; yet it antecedes this Passive Justification (which as has been afore described is so called by good Men) or the inseparable Concomitant thereof: But all the other Acts conforming the Soul to a risen Jesus, are consequential of Faith. 5. The former (as Divines say) is compleat at first (for he never Repents of his Act) the latter gradually, notwithstanding this makes not first and second Justification in the Popish Sense. This latter I grant, Faith instrumentally produces and gives a being too: But to the former, 'tis instrumental to in no Sense, but to the Conscience-Knowledge thereof. But if it be still objected. Does Faith justify only Declaratively or Manifestatively? I Answer, Take Faith for the Object of Faith, it does abundance more; for it justifies also materially, formally, and efficiently: But if you take Faith in a proper Sense, whether for Habit, Act, or both, it justifies not conditionally. And I have abundantly proved, it justifies not instrumentally, as producing the being of Justification in the former Sense; but instrumentally as to the Conscience-Knowledge of this Active Justification, and instrumentally as to the producing the Passive one in the Soul. So that I judge it no Heresie to affirm, but a most glorious Truth; that in Reference to God's justifying Act terminated on the Conscience, through imputed Righteousness manifested; it justifies only declaratively, &c. But if the Reader would have further Satisfaction in this Matter: He may peruse Mr. Eyre's Book from Page 106. to Page 145. And I wonder the Prefacer would take no notice of Mr. Eyres Explanation and Arguments in that Point.

2. My second Answer is; that suppose this was such an Heresie; yet how does it follow from Eternal Justification in the Sense afore explained? 'Tis enough for me to say, I deny his Consequence, and require him to make it good: But that has been the least of his Care, to evince his Consequences to be lawful and genuine. Yet I would feign know of him, how does this accursed Principle follow more from our Tenet of Eternal Justification, than from what he and others hold with us? viz. That God actually loved his chosen ones from Eternity; actually Elected and predestinated them: Since Eternal Justification in our Sense, is a Branch thereof thus diversified from that Respect it has precisely to some Part of the Means predestinated in Order to the end, as afore mentioned?

3. I Answer, (1.) Though a Notional Faith floating only in the Head, changes not the State nor Course of Life; but may give Encouragement to Drunkards and Whore-Masters through the deceitfulness of Lust to continue in their Wicked Courses (as some of Old would continue in Sin, that Grace might abound, *Rom.* 6. 1. And turned the Grace of God into Lasciviousness, Jude) Yet that Faith that is of the saving Operation of the Spirit, Purifies the Heart and Walk, *Acts* 15. 9. *ch.* 16. 28. *1 Pet.* 1. 22. Obeying the Truth in this Place, is by a Periphrasis put for Faith. Hence 'tis frequently stiled in Scripture a Holy Faith. And to prove this Truth from each of it's Particulars; (1.) 'Tis plain from Scripture, that all Parts of Holiness is carried on by Faith in Exercise. Thus Mortification of Sin is in all it's Parts. As (1.) Saving Conviction of Sin, *Isa.* 6. 5. The Spirit as a Comforter, savingly convinces of Sin, and that by convincing the Soul of Judgment and Righteousness, *John* 16. 7. the 12th, (2.) Saving Compunction and Sorrow for Sin, *Zeck.* 12. 10. (3.) True and Evangelical loathing of Self and Sin. This made *Isaiab* cry out of his Vileness, *Isa.* 6. 5. Made Holy Job after all (though a Perfect and upright Man) abhor and repent himself in Dust and Ashes, *Job* 42. 5, 6. See further *Ezek.* 16. ver. 53. and 54. compared, ver. 60. and 61. compared, ver. 62. and 63. compared. Also *Ezek.* 36. ver. 24. to 31. compared with 31. and 32. (4.) Right Confession of Sin, *Luke* 15. ver. 20, 21. (5.) Forsaking of Sin, *Rom.* 6. 2, 3, 4. &c. 11, 12, 13, 14. with many other Places.

2. As Mortification of Sin in all its Parts, is carried on by Faith, laying hold and applying to it self the Grace of Christ. So Faith receiving sensibly into the Conscience superabounding Grace in Christ, and the Righteousness of Jesus as a free Gift, causes that Soul to reign in spiritual Life by one Christ Jesus, *Rom.* 5. 17. And thus Faith in exercise, carries on positive Holiness in all its Branches, this the whole Man in Thought, Word, and Deed. In Thought: As

(1.) A

Him to
7. 23.
in the
Boldness
od, Pu-
2. Eph.
4. 16.
ive, ac-
former-
otion of
ight be
hich as
But all
ner (as
withfran-
faith in-
nse, but
eratively
; for it
ther for
not in-
s to the
five one
erence to
; it ju-
He may
e no no-
om Eter-
nce, and
ences to
ow more
that God
Eternal
to some
ate nor
deceitful-
as Grace
hat is
et. 1. 22.
in Scrip-
om Scrip-
is in all
y convin-
the 12th,
athing of
though I
mer Ezek.
lo Ezek.
20, 21.
to it self
Christ,
e Christ
this the
(1.) A

(1.) A Heavenly Conversation, compare *Phil. 3. 20.* with *ver. 8.* to the 15. which further appears in considering, that this Heavenly Conversation is an Holy Fellowship maintained with the Father and the Son, 1 *John 1. 3.* compar'd with it, *ver. 7.* This will be clearer yet; if we view how this Holy Communion in all its particulars must be carried on by Faith in exercise. (1.) As 'tis the Souls approach to God, *He that cometh to God must believe, &c. Heb. 11. 6.* (2.) As 'tis a coming to God as a reconciled God and Father through the appointed way Christ, his Purity, Obedience and Blood, *John 10. 9.* chap. 14. 6. *Heb. 10. 10, 19, 20. &c.* There is no coming to God, but through Christ; *Heb. 7. 25, Eph. 2. 18.* Nor no coming to Christ not by Christ, but through Faith; *John 13. 1. Acts 20. 21.* Repentance or returning towards God is by Faith in the Lord Jesus. (3.) As 'tis a viewing, and admitting his boundless Eternal Love and Grace manifested in the Son of his Love, and together therewith the Love of the Redeemer in our Natures; 1 *John 4. 16.* To dwell in God, and to have God dwell in the Soul, is to have Communion with him. But says the Holy Ghost here, *To dwell in God, &c. is to know and believe the Love, that he has to us.* (4.) As 'tis a Prostration of the Soul and Conscience at the Throne and Foot-stool of this free Love, it cannot be managed, but in a way of Believing. Thus the Prodigal, *Luke 15.* believing he was his Father, still bowed down afore him. (5.) As it makes returns of flaming Love again. No Soul can Love God, till he first believes God's Love through Christ to his own Soul, 1 *John 4. 10.*

(2.) As a Heavenly Trade and Conversation, consists in an inward Soul Exercise of the Grace and Fruits of the Spirit, 'tis also carried on by Faith. For (1.) 'Tis Faith that brings Supplies of Influences from the Fulness of Christ, *John 1. 14.* 'Tis Faith going to God in the fulness of Christ for Assistance, that in the very direct Act draws Water of Life out of the same fulness for Assistance, *John 15. 4. 5. Rom. 5. 17.* (2.) 'Tis the same Faith continued in Act, that prepares, disposes and excites this received Seed into exercise diversified according to the Object. Thus Faith as it views the beloved Object goes forth and works in Love towards it, *Gal. 5. 6.* 'Tis said to *Work by Love.* Faith acting into the fulness of Christ, empties the Soul of self, and so works by true Humility and Self-denial; and so of the rest, Hope, Patience, Joy, Meekness, &c. (3.) Faith promotes these Graces into outward Fruits of Holiness.

(3.) As a Heavenly Conversation, consists otherwise in diversity of Holy Thoughts and Meditations, concerning God and Christ, his Kingdom, Glory, Ways, Commands, Church, &c. they are all excited, promoted and directed by a lively Faith. Because no Thoughts of God are right, but of God in Christ; nor any Thoughts of Christ truly spiritual, but what spring from Faith. They that would exercise Thoughts, as Persons risen with Christ, must exercise them in Believing. They whose Meditations, would seek things above, must seek them above where Christ is, *viz. at God's Right Hand,* and 'tis Faith alone can seek them there, *Col. 3. 1, 2, 3.* Thus have I proved from the Scriptures of Truth, that Faith carries on the great Work of Heart-holiness.

(2.) Faith in like manner promotes Holiness of Lip. And what is that, but confessing with the Mouth, what we believe with the Heart, *Rom. 10. 10.* So, 'tis undeniably true, that Holy Profession as 'tis a Lip labour, consists in professing with the Mouth, what we believe with the Heart concerning God and Christ, and their things, and our Interest in them, and concerning our selves; what we are in our Selves, and what we are in our Head, and the Relation we stand in to God as our Father, and this in Prayer, Praise, and Conference, &c. All our Speech that *Minister's Grace to the Hearers,* *Eph. 4. 29.* ought to be in the round of our Holy Profession. And this Holy Profession, cannot be maintained without Faith, and Faith in exercise. We must hold fast our Faith, if we hold fast the Profession of our Faith. We must not only know but believe, or our afore-mentioned Profession will be vile Hypocrisy, and not the Holy Language of *Canaan.* Thus also this Truth is confirmed, that Holiness of Tongue must flow from lively Faith in Exercise. And

(3.) No less does Faith manage Holiness of Life. When the Apostle urges *Timothy* to the performance of divers Holy Duties; he directs him how, 2 *Tim. 2. 1.* *My Son be strong in the Grace, that is in Christ Jesus.* And there is no being strong therein, but by a strong and firm Conscience-persuasion thereof. 'Tis putting on the Lord Jesus by Faith, *i. e.* believing on him as our Head and Surety destroys all base Designs in the Soul for Self and Sin. This obstructs making Provision for the Flesh to fulfil the Lusts thereof, *Rom. 13. 14.* A Holy Conscience-persuasion of the Spiritual Privileges we have in Christ will make us careful to maintain good Works, *Tit. 3. 8.* in the way of Believing. The Grace of God as received by true Faith to reign in the Conscience, teaches to deny ungodliness and worldly Lusts, and to live righteously, soberly and godly in this present World, *Tit. 2. 11, 12.* All outward Religious Performances towards God, are Acts of Worship and Religious Service. They must be done in Faith as *Abel's* was, or they will not be accepted; *Heb. 11. 3, 6.* For without Faith 'tis impossible to please him.

All Worship, if True and Evangelical must be in *Spirit and in Truth*, John 4. 23. (1.) As of old the Worship was typically true, if in the Place divinely appointed; if offered in the appointed Garments, and on the Consecrated Altar: So now the Worship is substantially true, if our Gifts be offered in the Temple opened in Heaven, viz. the Person of Christ manifested there: And the Worshipers by Faith put on the Priestly Garments of Christ's Righteousness, and offer their Gifts on that Altar, the Purity of his Nature advance to an infinite value by the Grace of Union: And without this the Worship cannot be true. Yea all outward Acts thereof; if they flow not from these inward Holy Acts, though externally according to Rule; yet 'tis but false Worships in God's account. Now thus to offer, as has been mentioned, requires not only Faith, but strong Faith. (2.) Evangelical Worship must be in Spirit too: And where the Spirit assists to the performance, he does it as a Spirit of Adoption; *witnessing with our Spirits that we are the Children of God, and teaching us to cry Abba Father*, Rom. 8. 15, 16. If we are led by the Spirit of God in our Worship, we Act as Sons of God, ver. 14. We Pray as Children to a Father, we Praise him as our Father; we hear him in the Ministry of the Gospel as a Father, and we do all to him as a Father: And all this cannot be done without Faith in Exercise. (3.) All Acts of Worship are Testimonies of Love to him, or they are not Right; and we cannot testify Love to him, without we Love him, nor can we Love him, unless we believe on him. But

2. All Duties of Temperance and Sobriety towards our Selves, of Justice and Mercy towards our Neighbour, are but wretched Legality, and painted Hypocrisy, unless done in Faith. 'Tis a Rule universally extensive the Holy Ghost gives us: *Whoever is not of Faith is Sin*, Rom. 14. 23.

All Duties, if not performed in Love want the Life and Soul of Holiness: And it must be Love to God as our Father, and to Christ as our Husband. It has been proved, there can be no such Love in our Hearts, but what is wrought from a Sense of our Father's Love unto us; and this Sense of his Love is acquired only by Faith. Thus I have proved by Particulars, that Holiness of Heart and Life is produced by a lively Faith.

2. Observe, Reader, that without such a Faith, there can be no Evangelical Holiness (and that's only Right) but what flows from Gospel Principles, urged by Gospel Motives, done by Gospel Means and performed for Gospel Ends. Now I will make it appear, that none of these can be without Faith in Exercise.

1. The Principles must be Infused Light, 1 Cor. 4. 6. Life, Ezek. 16. 6. and Love, 2 Cor. 5. 14. (these being the *Principia quibus*.) Now the two first of these, in their first flowing in form Faith, and their influx is continued by the Exercise of Faith; which is that *Bucket*, that draws Water out of the Wells of Salvation. The Third is always the Effect of sensible Faith: And Faith is that great Channel or Conduit-pipe, through which they are conveyed to the Soul.

2. The Motives are from the free Love and Grace of God manifested in the Person, and undertakings of Christ Jesus. All which must be apprehended by Faith: For Faith alone apprehends the Record, that God gives of his Son, and of that Eternal Life in and by him, 1 John 5. 10, 14.

3. The Means by which Holy Graces are exercised, and Works of Holiness done, is by virtue of Union to the Person of Christ; and this I grant, and affirm, that this Union is not influential, or at least sensibly influential, if not apprehended by Faith. In him we must spiritually Live, Move and Act. All our spiritual Actings must be as Members of him, and by virtue of Implantation into him; John 15. 4, 5. As my Finger moves every time in the Life of my Body, and in the Face of the Spirits, that reside in the Head: So the Members of the Lord Christ, when they move and act aright, move and act in the Life and Fulness that's their Head: And Faith is the alone Instrument of this influential Implantation, and of all spiritual actings in the virtue thereof. The *principium quod* of our spiritual acting, is the fulness of Grace in our Head, 2 Tim. 2. 1. That's the Fountain, that sends down continual Rivulets into the Soul. And Faith is the ground-way of Conveyance: So that a Soul cannot perform what is good by the right Means thereof, but in Faith.

4. The End of our Good Works, should not be to purchase, procure, or obtain any of his Favours: But for the Praise of the Glory of his free Grace, and to the Honour of him; *Who hath called us out of Darkness to his marvellous Light*, Eph. 1. 6. 1 Pet. 2. 9. Now 'tis impossible for any Soul to have these right aims and ends in good Works without Faith in exercise; which I thus prove. Either a Soul must Act for to gain spiritual Life, or from that Life already received; there can be no third. The former he cannot, because the Hypothesis supposes him without Life, and therefore unable to stir or move; consequently it must be the latter, i. e. from Life received. And where-ever there is Life received, it supposes Faith.

2. The Service must be either servile or filial, either for wages, or because of an Inheritance given and

and sure. The former is not true Service, for 'tis against the Current of Scripture; and Nature of Evangelical Holiness; therefore the latter is. And it follows, he that serves as a Son has received the Charter or Grant of Adoption which is received by Faith, *John* 1. 12. And the Spirit of Adoption, which is consequential of Believing. *Eph.* 1. 13.

3. If the End of Holy Duties be to the Praise of free Grace, and to the Honour of a Father and Husband; then this infallibly supposes Faith in the Subject that has already received Grace, *Eph.* 2. 6. And that does practically know and acknowledge God to be his Father, and Christ to be his Husband. Then upon the whole; if without Faith, and Faith in Exercise; there can be no Right, Principle, Motive, Mean, or End of good Works (and consequently without these or either of these, the most splendid Works for outward shew cannot be Holy.) Then Faith is *not the Way to licentiousness*. But it has been proved without Faith in Exercise, there can be no true Holiness: This Truth the first Reformers earnestly contended for, and the Homilies of the Church of England excellently set forth; and (I am most confident) is the *Prefacer's* Judgment; then why such a scurvy Reflection on Faith, whereas I am satisfied, he knows in his Conscience, 'tis not a Notional and Hypocritical Faith, we mean or contend for. Though we say, Faith in the proper Sense, justifies in the Conscience only declaratively; yet we affirm, that in so doing it has other great uses; the greatest whereof is to produce Holiness of Conversation.

3. Observe, as Faith, and that as 'tis justifying, purifies the Conscience; nay the whole Man and his Conversation. So 'tis Faith, as it evidences to the Soul it's free Justification in Christ, and justifies in the Conscience *declaratively*, (which is the Assertion the *Prefacer* ridicules) that promotes Holiness of Heart and Walk. Which I thus evince.

1. Mr. Baxter, and many grant; that Faith of Assurance is a Duty, and to be pressed after by the Saints. Because (1.) There are many Duties, that cannot be performed without it. As (1.) Unless we know we have Christ, we cannot sensibly and strongly rejoice in Christ as our own; without which we cannot perform that Duty. *Rejoice always and evermore*, 1 *Thes.* 5. 16. and have strong Consolation, as the Will of God is, we should, *Heb.* 6. (2.) We can never Praise God aright without it: Who can Bless and Praise him for Christ his Righteousness, and the Eternal Love of God to him; but he that is Persuaded in his Conscience, that Christ and his Righteousness is his; and that God's Eternal Love in Christ is towards him: 'Twas this made *David* break forth into Praise, *Psal.* 103. And into Triumphing, *Rom.* 8. 35, 37, 38, 39. *John* and the New Testament Saints into Songs of Thanksgiving, *Rev.* 1. 5, 6. chap. 5. 9, 10, &c. (3.) To add no more, without this Assurance of Faith, no Soul can perform aright the Duty of Self-Examination. 'Tis the Duty of every Christian to examine himself, whether he be in the Faith, and what manner of Stuff he lays in his Building: Whether Wood, Hay, or Stubble, or else Gold, Silver, and precious Stones? Whether their inward Qualifications, and outward Duties are truly Holy? For to what Purpose is it, for a Person to go on in doing good Works (as so called) and not know whether they are so indeed; to go forward still in Building, and yet not know whether their Building will abide the Fire. Nay, I shall prove hereafter, they cannot be very good; unless a Person knows they are so. Blind Work-men and Blind-work, are not well-pleasing in God's sight. Now since 'tis an undoubted Truth, that no Work is Holy; but what flows from Faith in Exercise, and that immediately: How can a Person know, that this or that good Work flows from Faith then in exercise; unless he knows that then he does Believe? but of this more hereafter. By what has been said, it appears several Holy Duties cannot be performed without this Assurance of Faith so much decry'd.

1. There is no Work or Duty inward or outward, that's rightly done without it. And that for these Reasons.

1. As long as the Conscience is defiled with Guilt, every Action of the whole Man is defiled; *Tit.* 1. 15. The Conscience is only cleansed, by the sensible removal of Guilt off of the Conscience; which does include, and suppose a Conscience-knowledge, and Persuasion of Pardon, *Heb.* 9. 14. ch. 10. 1.

2. The Conscience must put a Man upon Service, either as a justified or a condemned Malefactor in Chains; either as a Slave for fear of Stripes, or as a loving Son. To leave the Matter uncertain is not only uncomfortable, but rather engages the Soul to serve as a Slave or condemned Malefactor. 'Tis service done in the Spirit of Freedom and Adoption, that is Holy and Acceptable Service. And without sensible removal of Guilt by Faith, assuring the Conscience of Pardon and Justification already in Christ, none can serve God in a filial Spirit; but merely out of slavish Fear, which is base and hypocritical Service, *Heb.* 9. 14. *Rom.* 6.

3. The Spirit, as bringing forth in the Soul Fruits unto Holiness, is said not to be the Spirit of Bondage; but the Spirit of Adoption, compared *Rom.* 11. 12. with 14. 15.

4. 'Tis

4. 'Tis impossible to have the Motives, Means, Aims and ends of a Duty right, (and without these a Duty cannot be right) without this Holy Persuasion of Conscience; that Christ and his Righteousness is ours, and God reconciled to us in him; as has been proved afore.

5. The Faith, that the Just is said to live by, is this Holy Conscience-Confidence and Assurance in the Lord and his Salvation, *Heb. 10. 38.* By the living of the Just here and elsewhere is intended all their spiritual and holy Walking. And what this Faith is by which the Just lives, is expressed in *ver. 35. Cast not away therefore your Confidence, &c.* But yet more plainly in the 22. *ver. Let us draw near with a true Heart in full assurance of Faith; having our Hearts sprinkled from an evil Conscience, &c.*

More might be added, but these are sufficient to prove; that Faith as evidently declaring Pardon in the Conscience, does not only include the change of the State, but has the highest tendency to mortify Sin, and quicken to Righteousness; nay, that without Holiness cannot be carried on, as it should be: So far is Faith, as it justifies in the Conscience, declaratively, from confirming Persons in their wickedness, To all which I add a

4. Consideration (*viz.*) That such a Faith as this changes the Estate, and begins as well as carries on Holiness of Life; which I thus evince, premising some Considerations.

1. That the Soul, is wholly Passive in God's first saving Work upon it.

2. That God in this first saving Work infuses a supernatural Principle of Divine Light and Life.

3. That this infused living Light is subservient to a true Conscience-Arraignment, as well as Conscience-Justification. Hereby the Soul at the same time comes to see and feel, 'tis without Righteousness Strength, and a discharge in it self considered in the first Adam; but at the same time is assured, there is Justification, Righteousness, and Strength freely for condemned, vile, impotent Sinners in the second Adam, *2 Cor. 1. 9. Isa. 45. 24.*

4. That by this saving discovery, that there is such a Remedy freely provided in another; as well as the prevalency of the Disease in ones self, the Soul is kept from sinking under Despair, under such a Conscience-Condemnation.

5. That this sight of the Remedy in respect of influences, admits of Degrees, sometimes it only keeps the Soul from quite Despairing; but Guilt and Conviction of Sin lies uppermost in the Conscience. Sometimes the Soul is kept in an indifferent poize between Hope and Fear.

6. That that keeps the Soul in Hope is, that at the first Manifestation of the Object under Sense of Condemnation, the Soul secretly leans on Christ and his Righteousness; whence the Distinction of the two fold acting of Faith on Christ. (1.) That which is more secret and insensible. (2.) That, that is more sensible and perceivable.

7. That this secret leaning on Christ discovers it self in an approbation of this Way of Salvation in willing and desiring to have an Interest in this Righteousness, and to draw nigh to God therein; and a great Sense of the absolute need thereof.

8. That Proportionable to these Efforts of a secret leaning on this Righteousness, there is Joy and Holiness in the Seed thereof; but not in the real lively and apparent Fruits.

9. That justifying Faith as the Scripture urges, it is such an Application to the Soul, as sensibly removes Guilt and Condemnation from the Conscience. And therefore is a more sensible Act of Faith, than what was afore described. 'Tis the Souls receiving Christ and his Righteousness as it's own, and God's justifying Act through Christ to himself.

10. That though the Estate be initially, yet not consummately changed; till such an Act is put forth, that believes this Righteousness as it's own, leans on it as it's own; goes to God in it as it's own, and pleads it for acceptance, and welcome as it's own. These things considered, I roundly assert, that, that Faith that consummately changes the State is that, that is more or less sensible or assuring, and in a proper Sense justifies in the Conscience declaratively. I prove it thus

1. If Faith in a proper Sense justifies in the Conscience no way; but Declaratively then it follows the first justifying Faith has more or less of this Conscience-assurance in it. But the former is true (as has been already proved) and therefore the latter.

2. The Faith the Scripture requires of such as see their need of Christ, is this Sensible Acting of Faith, *Heb. 3. 14.* (1.) See that Place, — If we hold fast the beginning of our Confidence stedfast to the end. So that the beginning must be Holy Confidence, see *ver. 6.* compared with *Deut. 1. 21.*

3. It appears, the Scripture requires of the Sinner such Faith at first for his Justification. Because it requires such an Act of Faith, as removes sensible Guilt from the Conscience, that the Soul might serve the living God; *Heb. 9. 14. Rom. 7. 4. Luke 1. 71, 74.* compared with *ver. 77, 78, 79.*

(3.) The Terms the Scripture give to justifying Faith, that suit with the lowest Experience thereof do

include in them more or less of Assurance. Looking to Christ, Coming to Christ, Leaning on Christ, if saving Acts do imply this Assurance. To Lean on Christ, is to lean on him as my own: So to Come to him, is to come to him as my own: To look to him, is to look to him as my own: Else it were no more than the looking of Devils and Damned Persons. They look unto him as a glorious Saviour (whose Salvation is infinitely full and free:) And yet, because they cannot behold him as their own, their looking does but the more Torment them; but more of this hereafter. (4.) The Word *(πίστις)* used in the New Testament for Faith, comes from *(πειθω)* to persuade intimating justifying Faith, to be an Holy, Practical, Conscience-persuasion. But a

Third Argument is, That God has given such clear Faith to desperate Sinners, that served Dumb Idols at first Conversion; so that such a Faith cannot be Heterodox. The Apostle affirms, that the Gospel broke in at first upon the Consciences of the *Thessalonians*, not in Word only, but also in Power, and in the Holy Ghost [and in much Assurance] &c. *1 Thes. 1. 5.* If it be objected, those were extraordinary Times, and that an extraordinary Work; I answer. But yet, was not that Faith wrought in them at first Conversion, the Faith of Miracles; therefore what was then, may be still and ought to be; For no Faith is pretended to be ceased; but the Faith of Miracles.

4. And so many were Preached unto thus to Believe, and with such a Faith they Believed; says the Apostle to the *Corinthian-Church*, *1 Cor. 15. 1.* Moreover Brethren, I declare unto you, the Gospel, which I preached unto you, which also you have received, &c. In the Third Verse, He rehearses, what the Gospel was, whose Declaration they believed; says he, *I delivered unto you first of all, that which I also received, how that Christ died for our Sins according to the Scriptures.* This was his first Faith, that Christ died for his Sin. This he declares to them, that Christ died for their Sin; this he says they did receive by Faith, that Christ died for their Sins; and it must follow, what these each individually received; That Christ died for his Sin; and all this according to the Scriptures. The Summ of the whole is this, that the Faith that changes the Estate, carries in it more or less of Assurance; and therefore in a proper Sense, justifies in the Conscience declaratively.

5. From all these laid together, it appears, that the Prefacer's flourish concerning the State of drunkards, Whoremongers, &c. and what follows most invidiously, is not the Consequence of either the Principles; but an old Third-bare Slander new vamped up, and only varied a little in the extending thereof. He know well enough, with others of his Kidney; we contend not for a notional head-knowledge of our being justified in Christ: But a saving practical Conscience-Knowledge thereof: And therefore, such virulence against the precious Faith of Gods Elect might have been spared. As to Satan, that Acts in their Tongues and Pens (as he of Old on Peter's Tongue) *We say the Lord deceive him.* As for the Persons of these our Brethren, we Love them, and pray for them, that this may not be laid to their Charge; but that Divine Light may shine in upon them, to the acknowledging of the Truth.

This Sixth Argument against Eternal Justification is this; that it inevitably infers, that Assurance is of the Essence of saving Faith, and the comfort of it inseparable from it; and the Consequence will be Discouragements to the Godly, who truly believe: And yet, do not know and feel in their own Consciences they do so. This is the Substance thereof, though not his Words. To which I give as afore a threefold Answer. 1. Premising some Distinctions, I judge 'tis a great Truth, that true justifying Faith has Assurance in its very Essence. First, I distinguish between Comfort, as flowing from the Act of Faith; and Assurance, as flowing from the Object apprehended.

1. I distinguish between Consolation, as impressed in upon our Spiritual Feeling, and is the same with Enjoyment.

2. As accompanying the Sense of Faith: The latter may be, where the former is wanting. The former is inseparable from Faith; but more or less according to the proportion of Faith. The former Soul cannot feel, though strong in Faith in the absence of spiritual Enjoyments. 3. As to Faith being a Conscience-assurance, I thus distinguish.

1. There is an Assurance of the Object. (2.) The Assurance of the Act. The former belongs to the Object; but not the latter.

1. There is a bare Assurance of the Object. (2.) An Assurance of the Object with Relation to my Faith is not only a bare Assurance of the Object; for Devils and Hypocrites may have that: But an Assurance of the Object with Relation to me. 'Tis not only a bare Conscience-Knowledge, that I am Righteousness in Christ; but that this Righteousness in Christ is for such a needy Sinner as I. This Assurance in Relation to my self is either perfect, excluding utterly all manner of Doubts, and Questions, or else (2dly.) That which is imperfect, admitting of a contrary mixture, I do

4. 'Tis impossible to have the Motives, Means, Aims and ends of a Duty right, (and without that a Duty cannot be right) without this Holy Persuasion of Confidence; that Christ and his Righteousness is ours, and God reconciled to us in him; as has been proved afore.

5. The Faith, that the Just is said to live by, is this Holy Confidence-Confidence and Assurance in the Lord and his Salvation, *Heb. 10. 38.* By the living of the Just here and elsewhere is intended all their spiritual and holy Walking. And what this Faith is by which the Just lives, is expressed in *ver. 35. Cast not away therefore your Confidence, &c.* But yet more plainly in the 22. *ver. Let us draw near with a true Heart in full assurance of Faith; having our Hearts sprinkled from an evil Conscience, &c.*

More might be added, but these are sufficient to prove; that Faith as evidently declaring Pardon in the Conscience, does not only include the change of the State, but has the highest tendency to mortify Sin, and quicken to Righteousness; nay, that without Holiness cannot be carried on, as it should be: *So far is Faith, as it justifies in the Conscience, declaratively, from confirming Persons in their wickedness, To all which I add a*

4. Consideration (*viz.*) That such a Faith as this changes the Estate, and begins as well as carries on Holiness of Life; which I thus evince, premising some Considerations.

1. That the Soul, is wholly Passive in God's first saving Work upon it.

2. That God in this first saving Work infuses a supernatural Principle of Divine Light and Life.

3. That this infused living Light is subservient to a true Confidence-Arraignment, as well as Confidence-Justification. Hereby the Soul at the same time comes to see and feel, 'tis without Righteousness Strength, and a discharge in it self considered in the first Adam; but at the same time is assured, there is Justification, Righteousness, and Strength freely for condemned, vile, impotent Sinners in the second Adam, *2 Cor. 1. 9. Isa. 45. 24.*

4. That by this saving discovery, that there is such a Remedy freely provided in another; as well as the prevalency of the Disease in ones self, the Soul is kept from sinking under Despair, under such a Confidence-Condemnation.

5. That this sight of the Remedy in respect of influences, admits of Degrees, sometimes it only keeps the Soul from quite Despairing; but Guilt and Conviction of Sin lies uppermost in the Confidence. Sometimes the Soul is kept in an indifferent poize between Hope and Fear.

6. That that keeps the Soul in Hope is, that at the first Manifestation of the Object under Sense of Condemnation, the Soul secretly leans on Christ and his Righteousness; whence the Distinction of the two fold acting of Faith on Christ. (1.) That which is more secret and insensible. (2.) That, that is more sensible and perceivable.

7. That this secret leaning on Christ discovers it self in an approbation of this Way of Salvation in willing and desiring to have an Interest in this Righteousness, and to draw nigh to God therein; and a great Sense of the absolute need thereof.

8. That Proportionable to these Efforts of a secret leaning on this Righteousness, there is Joy and Holiness in the Seed thereof; but not in the real lively and apparent Fruits.

9. That justifying Faith as the Scripture urges. it is such an Application to the Soul, as sensibly removes Guilt and Condemnation from the Conscience. And therefore is a more sensible Act of Faith, than what was afore described. 'Tis the Souls receiving Christ and his Righteousness as it's own, and and God's justifying Act through Christ to himself.

10. That though the Estate be initially, yet not consummately changed; till such an Act is put forth, that believes this Righteousness as it's own, leans on it as it's own; goes to God in it as it's own, and pleads it for acceptance, and welcome as it's own. These things considered, I roundly assert, that, that Faith that consummately changes the State is that, that is more or less sensible or assuring, and in a proper Sense justifies in the Conscience declaratively. I prove it thus

1. If Faith in a proper Sense justifies in the Conscience no way; but Declaratively then it follows the first justifying Faith has more or less of this Confidence-assurance in it. But the former is true (as has been already proved) and therefore the latter.

2. The Faith the Scripture requires of such as see their need of Christ, is this Sensible Acting of Faith, *Heb. 3. 14.* (1.) See that Place, — *If we hold fast the beginning of our Confidence steadfast to the end.* So that the beginning must be *Holy Confidence*, see *ver. 6.* compared with *Deut. 1. 21.*

3. It appears, the Scripture requires of the Sinner such Faith at first for his Justification. Because it requires such an Act of Faith, as removes sensible Guilt from the Conscience, that the Soul might serve the living God; *Heb. 9. 14. Rom. 7. 4. Luke 1. 71, 74.* compared with *ver. 77, 78, 79.*

(3.) The Terms the Scripture give to justifying Faith, that suit with the lowest Experience thereof

include in them more or less of Assurance. Looking to Christ, Coming to Christ, Leaning on Christ, if saving Acts do imply this Assurance. To Lean on Christ, is to lean on him as my own: So to Come to him, is to come to him as my own: To look to him, is to look to him as my own: Else it were no more than the looking of Devils and Damned Persons. They look unto him as a glorious Saviour (whose Salvation is infinitely full and free:) And yet, because they cannot behold him as their own, their looking does but the more Torment them; but more of this hereafter. (4.) The Word (*πιστις*) used in the New Testament for Faith, comes from (*πειθο*) to persuade intimating justifying Faith, to be an Holy, Practical, Conscience-persuasion. But a

Third Argument is, That God has given such clear Faith to desperate Sinners, that served Dumb Idols at first Conversion; so that such a Faith cannot be Heterodox. The Apostle affirms, that the Gospel broke in at first upon the Consciences of the *Thessalonians*, not in Word only, but also in Power, and in the Holy Ghost [and in much Assurance] &c. *1 Thes. 1. 5.* If it be objected, those were extraordinary Times, and that an extraordinary Work; I answer. But yet, was not that Faith wrought in them at first Conversion, the Faith of Miracles; therefore what was then, may be still and ought to be; For no Faith is pretended to be ceased; but the Faith of Miracles.

4. And so many were Preached unto thus to Believe, and with such a Faith they Believed; says the Apostle to the *Corinthian-Church*, *1 Cor. 15. 1. Moreover Brethren, I declare unto you, the Gospel, which I preached unto you, which also you have received, &c.* In the Third Verse, He rehearses, what the Gospel was, whose Declaration they believed; says he, *I delivered unto you first of all, that which I also received, how that Christ died for our Sins according to the Scriptures.* This was his first Faith, that Christ died for his Sin. This he declares to them, that Christ died for their Sin; this he says they did receive by Faith, that Christ died for their Sins; and it must follow, what these each individually received; *That Christ died for his Sin; and all this according to the Scriptures.* The Summ of the whole is this, that the Faith that changes the Estate, carries in it more or less of Assurance; and therefore in a proper Sense, justifies in the Conscience declaratively.

5. From all these laid together, it appears, that the Preface's flourish concerning the State of Drunkards, Whoremongers, &c. and what follows most invidiously, is not the Consequence of either of the Principles; but an old Thred-bare Slander new vamped up, and only varied a little in the extending thereof. He know well enough, with others of his Kidney; we contend not for a notional head-knowledge of our being justified in Christ: But a saving practical Conscience-Knowledge thereof: And therefore, such virulence against the precious Faith of Gods Elect might have been spared. As for Satan, that Acts in their Tongues and Pens (as he of Old on *Peter's Tongue*) *We say the Lord shake him.* As for the Persons of these our Brethren, we Love them, and pray for them, that this may not be laid to their Charge; but that Divine Light may shine in upon them, to the acknowledging of the Truth.

This Sixth Argument against Eternal Justification is this; that it inevitably infers, that Assurance is of the Essence of saving Faith, and the comfort of it inseparable from it; and the Consequence will be Discouragement to the Godly, who truly believe: And yet, do not know and feel in their own Consciences they do so. This is the Substance thereof, though not his Words. To which I give as afore a threefold Answer. 1st, Premising some Distinctions, I judge 'tis a great Truth, that true justifying Faith has Assurance in its very Essence. First, I distinguish between Comfort, as flowing from the Act of Faith immediately, As flowing from the Object apprehended.

2nd, I distinguish between Consolation, as impressed in upon our Spiritual Feeling, and is the same Joy and Enjoyment.

3rd, As accompanying the Sense of Faith: The latter may be, where the former is wanting. The former is inseparable from Faith; but more or less according to the Proportion of Faith. The former the Soul cannot feel, though strong in Faith in the absence of Spiritual Enjoyments.

As to Faith being a Conscience-assurance, I thus distinguish.

1. There is an Assurance of the Object. (2.) The Assurance of the Act. The former belongs to Faith; but not the latter.

There is a bare Assurance of the Object. (2.) An Assurance of the Object with Relation to my Faith is not only a bare Assurance of the Object; for Devils and Hypocrites may have that: But Assurance of the Object with Relation to me. 'Tis not only a bare Conscience-Knowledge, that is Righteousness in Christ; but that this Righteousness in Christ is for such a needy Sinner as I. This Assurance in Relation to my self is either perfect, excluding utterly all manner of Doubts, and Questions, or else (2^{dly}.) That which is imperfect, admitting of a contrary mixture. I do

not mean Assurance in the first Sense; for that would suppose Faith to be perfect here without the intermixture of the least grain of Unbelief. No Saint is perfect in Believing. For when they act very highly, they find a weight still pressing them down, and they wonder they are not more affected with the things they believe; there being more of the Head than Heart in the best Acts of Faith they put forth. Matters being thus explained. I affirm Assurance in the afore-mentioned Sense is in the very Nature of Faith. And if enough has not been said to prove it, I shall add somewhat more.

1. If the contraries to Faith be Staggering. *Rom. 4. 20.* Wavering, *Heb. 10. 23.* Doubting, *Ma. 14. 31.* Fear, *Mark 5. 36.* Then the Nature of Faith consists in Confidence and Assurance. But the contraries of Faith are so; as the former Scriptures hold forth, therefore there is in Faith, Confidence and Assurance. For contraries do very much illustrate the Nature of a thing. So do the contraries of Faith explain the Nature of Faith.

2. The Experience of the Old and New Testament Saints, shew Faith has Assurance in it. See *Abraham's Faith, Rom. 4. 20, 21.* *David's, Psalm 18. 2. Psalm 23. 27, 46.* *Moses and the Churches of Old, Exod. 15. 2.* The Prophets as representing the Church, *Isa. 12. 2.* In New Testament Days, see *Paul's, Rom. 8. ult. Gal. 2. 20.* *Paul with the Church of Corinth's, 1 Cor. 15. 1, 2, 3, &c.* *John's, Rev. 1. 5, 6.* The Saints, *Rev. 5. 9, 10, &c.* all which express Assurance; which may be evidently seen by perusing these Places of Scripture with several others.

3. The Faith, the Saints expressed under Darkness and Desolation contained Assurance therein. See *David's sore Trials expressed in Psalm 31. 9, 10, &c.* yet *verse 3. Thou art my Rock, and my Fortress—verse 14. — I said thou art my God.* So *Psalm 42.* Read his great Desolation, Sorrow, and Trials, *ver. 2, 3, 4, 5, 7.* yet he cries out, *ver. 6. O my God — ver. 9. I will say unto God, my Rock, — ver. 11. Who is the health of my Countenance, and my God.* *Psalm 88.* is a most doleful Psalm: yet begins, *O Lord God of my Salvation.* Direction is given to any in Darkness to *stay on his God, Isa. 50. 10.* Let the Godly Reader judge, whether these be not great Expressions of Holy Confidence in a dark and desolate Hour. And if then such Confidence must be expressed; when Faith is stript of all its crutches, it undeniably infers, that in the Nature of Faith there is Holy Assurance.

4. As has been alleged afore, there is the afore-specified Assurance in every scriptural Expression; that sets forth Faith. A Soul made truly sensible of its own guilt, and the wrath that Sin deserves: Of its own Vileness, impotency and incapacity to satisfy the Justice and Law of God, cannot be put off with an Assurance there is a Remedy for others; if he has not a dram of Assurance that it is for him. A Soul thus awakened, will not trifle with a general view of a compleat Righteousness in Christ; but be serious in the Matter; and take no Rest, nor find any Peace, without believing 'tis for him. A Conscience loaded with the Sense of guilt, will not be disburthened without some Assurance and Knowledge, there is Pardon for him purchased by the Blood of Jesus. To which I add

5. The Definition our Modern Divines have (as they think more prudentially) give of Faith; does also contain the afore described Assurance therein. In a fiducial Recumbency, as an Act of the Will, there is a confident Leaning on Christ's Righteousness as that, that does indeed give acceptance. Faith as 'tis said to Assent and Consent to the way of Acceptance alone, through Christ and his Righteousness, with a gust relish and delight, must include Assurance more or less in the Conscience, that there is acceptance for him in the Righteousness of Jesus; or a Conscience truly awakened, without some Holy Trust and Confidence, in this durst not expect acceptance, nor draw nigh to God with delight. The same may of Faith, as defined, to be an Assent and Consent to the way of Salvation by Christ with an acquiescence of the Soul therein: Which must imply the acquiescence of the Soul, for it's own Justification and Acceptance in the Righteousness of Jesus: For as was said afore, how can a Conscience truly awakened, acquiesce in this; that there is enough in Christ of Pardon and Righteousness for another; but he knows not, whether there is a dram for him? The Soul rightly sensible of it's own particular need and want of Pardon and Justification, cannot acquiesce that there is enough in Christ for Sinners, unless the Conscience arrives to some well-grounded Assurance; that this All-sufficiency of Christ is for him a miserable Sinner also. So that however (for some ends) good Men have wrapped up and hid the Nature of Faith in variety of Scholastick Expressions for to oppose Faith, as an Assurance or Confidence; yet that Assurance in our Sense, that is, of the being of Faith does yet shine forth through their eclipsing Definitions.

6. And Lastly, All hold, that particular Application is of the Soul and Essence of saving Faith. And hereby the Point is granted. For I would fain know what in plain English is a particular Application of Christ's Righteousness to my Soul; but a believing there is Righteousness in Christ for me, a filthy unrighteous Sinner; and therefore, I pray come to God as my Father, firmly trusting for acceptance

dance herein. Let Divines define particular Application, by what Metaphysical Terms they please; the honest plain Christian will take it for no less, than a believing Christ and his Righteousness is his; that Christ hath satisfied for him, and that God hath pardoned and justified him in Christ his Surety. From all the foregoing, I conclude Conscience-assurance is of the very Essence of saving Faith; even in the Sense it has been explained. But they that would see this more fully proved, may peruse Mr. Marjhal's excellent Treatise of Sanctification; particularly from Page 168, to 193. But

2. I Answer, If it were granted, this were an Error; yet how does it follow from our Notion of Eternal Justification, no more than from what we hold in common concerning Eternal Love, Predestination, Election, &c. especially since we affirm, Eternal Justification in our Sense, is no more than a Branch of Election, as it refers to some Part of the Means.

Answer 3. I deny his Consequence, viz. That the accused Definition of Faith, has a tendency to discourage the Saints; whom says he, may have true Faith, though they do not know it. The Thing I grant is true, they may have so. But that they know it not, 'tis for want of better Instruction; and they may thank such, who by their Ministry,

1. Keep them in Ignorance, and will not instruct them. (1.) What must be the ground of their Faith and Conscience-persuasion, viz. Not Qualifications, Marks, or Signs, in themselves; but the infinite fullness of the Grace that is in Christ for Sinners so suited to their needs, and the infinite freeness thereof, as tendered and held forth in free, absolute, unconditional Promises. And the Authority of God, who commands Sinners as Sinners, in the Sense of their absolute need of Christ and his Righteousness; to take him as their own, and venture on him as such: Not from any Motives whatever in themselves; but from Motives fetched from the Object, and the faithfulness of the Promiser, and in Obedience to his great Command of Believing. (2.) In the Nature of their own acting, of Faith; which they would hide from themselves; and shew them, that in what they Experience in themselves of the lowest acts of true Faith, there is real assurance of the Object in Relation to themselves. That in their looking to Christ with pleasedness and support, they do really look to him as their own; or their thoroughly awakened Consciences could have no Ease nor Peace, with bare looking to him without any Persuasion of their Interest; or that in their coming to Christ, their Consciences come to him indeed, as the way to the Father. And that in Leaning on him and his Righteousness, their Consciences are in some Measure persuaded, that they are in him and his Righteousness, and as in him justified and accepted, &c. (3.) That they do not instruct them, that 'tis their Duty to know their own acts, and to bring them forth to act before the Conscience, with as much clearness and plainness as possible; and that 'tis their Duty to charge their Consciences to speak out plainly, and without flammerings. If Leaning on Christ for acceptance, be the same with a practical Persuasion, that God does accept me in Christ; and that it is the same with this. I am now justified and accepted in Christ. The last is the most plain, and effectual for Consolation, and Holiness: Why are not the Consciences of the Saints directed and charged to speak on, till they speak out very plain; so that they may be understood by themselves and others. Conscience in the Language of Faith, should not only say, in the Lord there is Righteousness and Strength for Sinners; and I have some little uncertain hope it is for me. But it should boldly say, In the Lord have I Righteousness and Strength. And not rest there, but go on and say, in the Lord above, such a Vile Sinner, as I, am completely Righteous: such an impotent Sinner, as I, am very Strong. Poor Souls should be persuaded to urge every direct act of Faith, into a reflex act of Faith, and not only lay hold on what is in Christ for them; but be assured, that they also are in Christ for them; and not only so; but what they are in Christ. Even their Person and Duties too: How fair! How accepted! 'Tis Faith drove up to this Head, that will bring Peace, Joy, Light, Life, and Love down into the Soul, even in a time of Desertion; and not only so, but bring forth Fruits unto Holiness, unless in the acting 'tis abundantly more an Head-work, than a Heart-work. But

2. They may thank them, who keep them in Ignorance, by terrifying them also from this Holy, practical, Conscience-Persuasion, with Bug-bear Names and false Insinuations. This Holy Assurance is called now a-days Antinomianism, Fancy, Delusion, and rendred Suspicious of feeding Souls with false Hopes, and teaching Licentiousness, till they are drowned in Perdition; whence poor Souls are made to shun their Duty and Happiness, worse than the Plague and Satan himself; and endeavour to flee all manner of Persuasion, that Christ is theirs; for fear of growing loose thereupon. Indeed I do not know, what some mean by keeping poor Souls in such Ignorance about the Nature of Faith, their own acts and their State, unless they judge, that Popish Maxim to be a Doctrine according to Holiness, viz. That Ignorance is the Mother of Devotion; and therefore the more ignorant they are,

and doubtful they are about their State; the more it will put them on Working. And so indeed sometimes it will. But what sort of Works will they be? No other than first Covenant-Works for Life. *Dead Works* that must be purged off the Conscience by the Blood of the Lamb; if ever they would serve the Living God aright, *Heb. 9. 14.* *Dead and unprofitable Works*; that they need a Repentance from, *Heb. 6. 1.*

3. They may thank them for laying afore their Consciences, such a Doctrine of Assurance as is False, Impracticable, Uncertain, and Corrupting.

1. 'Tis False. For (1.) The true Assurance has Christ and his Fulness, that is above for it's Object. Their Assurance has partly Christ, and partly inward Qualification. (2.) Scriptural Faith of Assurance is founded upon the Truth of free Promises. This of theirs upon conditional ones. 'Tis Grace infinitely Free, that true Faith is encouraged from, and does embrace; but that sort of Assurance, embraces only conditional Grace; and is encouraged from supposed Conditions found out in a legal Walk. The formal Reason of true Assurance of Faith, is Obedience to the Command, But of this, is a Conscience claim upon performance of Conditions. So the Assurance commended to poor Souls, has nothing of the Nature of Faith in it: For the Nature of Faith is to receive Grace as freely offered. So consequently 'tis false.

2. 'Tis Impracticable, as 'tis defined. 'Tis setting up Qualifications, to judge of the Truth of Faith by, in their Light; whereas the Light of Faith must judge of them, whether they are right or no. If no Qualifications be right, but what flows from Faith in immediate Exercise; I must necessarily know first, I then truly believe; before I can tell, that such Qualifications are the real product of my exercised Faith.

3. 'Tis Uncertain. For (1.) Though a *Pharisee* may soon arrive at Comfort thereby: Yet where there is the least spark of true Grace, they may be very long ere they come at the least drop of Consolation: And (2.) 'Tis soon lost. And (3.) At best 'tis but very dark. Were not Souls willing to be flattered into false Hopes, they could have no stable Joy from it. The true Assurance may be obtained at first, and continued under Desertion. Says *Calvin*, *Nisi fidem tremere & vacillare volumus*, &c. Unless we will have our Faith be trembling and wavering. 'Tis necessary we found it on the free Promises of Grace in Christ.

4. 'Tis Corrupting. It does not truly purifie Heart, Lip, nor Life. The Joys and Comforts, that flow from it make the Soul but the worse: Whereas true Assurance of Faith purifies all; as has been proved. That sort of Assurance, has a tendency to neglect Spiritual Communion and Holy Walking. It does not awe sin and quicken to Holiness, by abiding in the presence of the Father and the Son. It does not derive supplies of Influences from the Fountain. It does not exert the Graces and Influences of the Spirit; Souls embracing this Cloud, instead of true Faith are prone to fall into spiritual Security. If they come hereby to a Presumption, that they have escaped Hell-fire, and are secure for Heaven, they can indulge themselves in a pursuit after the World, Self-seeking and Sin; provided that they can keep their Consciences quiet, and keep up their quiet, and keep up their Reputation among other Professors. Hence it appears, that all Comforts fetch't from an Assurance built on Marks and Signs, make the Soul rather worse than better. And has a tendency to Licentiousness. Therefore how dangerous is it to take away from Souls the right Assurance of Faith, and gave them this instead of it, that is not true; but is impracticable, uncertain, and Soul-defiling. Now let the Godly Reader judge; which Definition of the Assurance of Faith, is the Helper of the Saint's Faith and Joy, and which the Destroyer? So that the Consequence fixed on us, returns on his own Principle.

His Seventh Argument is, That 'tis directly contrary to the express Word of God. I Answer.

1. 'Tis not true, I challenge him and all to produce one Scripture, through the whole Book of God, that contradicts, that that Sentence conceived in God's mind from Eternity, towards elect Sinners pronounced unto them on Christ their Head; when he arose from the Dead is no Justification. The Place he alleges does not. For (1.) There is a Condemnation, which is the same with suffering the Vengeance of Eternal Fire; from which they are fundamentally secured by God's Eternal Will not to punish them. (2.) There is a Condemnation at the publick Tribunal of Justice in his promulgated Word: And that again is twofold. (1.) Condemnation of all, that fell in *Adam* in general, *Rom. 5. 16.* As they were *Adam's* Race, unless Covenant Conditions be performed by them, or by one for them, and publick, complete Satisfaction be given to Law and Justice. Now from this, the Elect number, *Quatenus* Elect, and Christ's Seed were fully delivered; when Christ died and rose again, *Rom. 8. 33, 34.* (2.) A Condemnation of their Estate, or of them in reference to their State. Justice on the Throne of the

Published Word pronounces, *That as many as are of the Works of the Law are under a Curse, i. e.* The whole Man is defiled, and whatever they do is accursed: Their State is a cursed State: Because it is a State of doing for Life. Justice on that Throne requires a twofold bringing in, and pleading of satisfaction. *First*, That Satisfaction be pleaded by their Surety; which was done, when he entered to Heaven: And had a Discharge put into his Hand for his whole Seed: But, *Secondly*, Justice requires that Conscience bring it, and plead it, where Conscience has the Discharge put into its Hand; or else it holds him fast in reference to his State and Conscience. And this brings me to the Third Sort of Condemnation, which is a Conscience Condemnation, *viz.* In the two latter Senses, the Elect Sinner lies under Condemnation: In reference to his State, as considered in the first *Adam*, and on the first Covenant; and as he stands at the Bar of his Conscience. But not in reference to Condemnation simply taken. But the *Prefacer* would have the Sinner freed at the Bar of his Conscience; (1.) Because his Conscience does not always feelingly condemn and hurry to Despair. (2.) Because a Conscience in a natural State, cannot condemn of the Sin of Unbelief. To both which I oppose these things. 1. 'Tis his mistake to think there is no Conscience Condemnation; but where there is felt and despair. Security and hardness of Heart, and Death of the Soul, are real Execution served from God's Bar; 'tis the Conscience, which always does suppose Condemnation. For every Execution legally served, does necessarily follow Condemnation going before. 2. This Execution is served on the Conscience for the Sin of Unbelief, or for rejecting Gospel Grace more eminently (to wit) Security, hardness of Heart, blindness of Mind, brawniness of Conscience. See *Isa. 6. 7, 8, 9, 10.* compared with *Mat. 13. 14.* and the other Evangelists, *John 12. 40. Acts 28. 26. Rom. 11. 8.* And this must necessarily suppose a Law Condemnation there for that very Sin, even for refusing to believe what the God of Truth declares in the Gospel. So I conclude, the Elect Sinner may be under Condemnation in his Conscience, and in reference to his State, when he is not under Condemnation in the Court of Heaven. So that, that Condemnation mentioned, *John 3. 18.* if took in the two latter Sense, may mean the Elect the Sinner: But if Condemnation there be understood simply and analogously it cannot intend the Elect Sinner at all; unless we vacate God's Will, and the Death of his Son. So I conclude, 'tis not true, that the Principle as held by us, is contrary to the express Word of God. But

According to it, *Eph. 1. 6.* Wherein he hath made us accepted in the Beloved. Dr. Goodwin proves undeniably, That, that Act is of God (*viz.* making accepted) is to be referred to Eternity as well as Election. And making accepted in the Beloved; whether it signifies precisely Justification, or somewhat more; to be sure it includes it. So it plainly follows, God from Eternity justified his chosen ones in the Beloved. I shall not here repeat; what I have afore quoted to this purpose. But add hereto his fifteenth, because near a Kin; *That it contradicts those Scriptures, that assert Justification by Faith.* Hereupon I ask him. Does the Object of Faith, existing afore the Act, destroy the Act or hinder the Object to be for the Act, when the Act does also Exist? Does the Sentence of Justification, as conceived in God's Mind from Eternity, pronounced to Christ at his Resurrection as the Sinners Surety; make void the terminating of this on the Sinners Conscience, and the receiving thereof by Faith? Sure one would think, that there could be no Justification by Faith; if you take away the Eternal Will of God, and the gracious Sentence out of his Mind; and deny the Pronunciation thereof to Christ our Head. Indeed then, there could be no Object for justifying Faith. So the Apostle argues, *1 Cor. 15. 14, 17.* Such Wire-drawing of Consequences, I am not fond to understand, as is used in this little Pamphlet. The Explanation of this Head is nothing to the Purpose, and falls not under my Notice in way of Argumentation.

His Eighth Argument is, That 'tis a Contradiction to affirm, *A Man to be actually Dead, and (he should have added) actually alive;* and (to Point his Argument for him) *actually condemned, and actually justified at one and the same Time.* I Answer.

I have told him, there is no Contradictions in Assertions; unless all the Conditions of Opposition be punctually there. If there be a failure in one, there is not a lawful Opposition: As for Instance, A Man may be said actually Alive, and actually Dead at one and the same time; but yet in divers Parts and Manner. He may be said to actually Alive in his Body; but spiritually Dead in his Soul. Actually Alive as to bodily Life, but actually Dead as to spiritual Life. So a Tree may be said to be actually Dead in the Branches, but actually Alive in the Root. And thus a Man may be said at one and the same time to be actually Pardoned by the King and Council, and this Pardon actually entered into the Court of Kings-Bench; And yet the same Person at the same time, for the same Crime, may be actually Condemned at an Inferior Court in the Countrey. And continue so judicially, till the Pardon comes down, and sets him *rectus in eâ Curia*: i. e. Discharged at the Bar. And no less

A Vindication of the Doctrine of

may an Elect Sinner be said at one and the same time, to be actually condemned as in the first *Adam* in respect of the Covenant he is under, and at the Bar of God in his Conscience also. And yet actually justified by Virtue of that secret Relation he has to the second *Adam*, as a Surety and Root, and that actual Justification he has in him; which his Surety has received for him; which he has a Right to in him; though not a Possession of in his Conscience. And this involves no Contradiction at all, as has been afore manifested. And therefore I need not add, but only this. That such seeming Contradictions are in a Believer. He may be actually Condemned by sensible Guilt in his Conscience, And yet the *Prefacer* will grant him to be then actually justified at the same time at God's Bar above. The Truths Faith receives, are a Mystery and seeming Contradiction to the Flesh. *I am Black, but Comely*, is a Contradiction to Flesh and Blood: But Faith reconciles it, Black in my self, but Comely in the comeliness of my Head. Thus again, *When I am weak, then am I strong*, says Faith, 2 Cor. 12. 10. This may appear Non-sense to the Wisdom of the Flesh: But Faith can make good Sense of it, and unfold it thus. When I am most emptied of my self, and see my inward spiritual weakness most; then do I go forth to Act most in the fulness of Christ, and in that *Strength in him above can do all things*. So this Language of Faith, 2 Cor. 6. 10. — *Having nothing, and yet possessing all things*, seems very absurd to Carnal Reason. But yet 'tis the Truth Faith feeds on; when it sees it has nothing in it's spiritual Sense; but that, that is quite starved: And yet, then it possesses all things by Faith in Christ the blessed Root and Head above. The things of Faith are Misterious, and above proud Reason. Therefore, if this *Prefacer* and others, bring down the Truths of Jesus, the peculiar Objects of Faith to the Bar of Carnal Reason, and the Wisdom of the Flesh. We the Ministers of Jesus, in the Name of our Lord and King enter a Caveat there, and protest against the Jurisdiction of the Wisdom of the Flesh, over the sublime Misteries of the Gospel, 1 Cor. 1. 19, 20, 21.

His Ninth, Tenth, Eleventh, and Twelfth Arguments are but one and the same; therefore I shall put them all into one, and cast them into this Form for him.

Actual Justification has inseparably annexed to it, as Concomitants, and immediate Consequents, Change of Heart. Effectual Calling, Sanctification and Holy Communion with God.

But in a State of Nature and afore Faith, there is none of these in the Soul. *Ergo*, none actually justified, till he does Believe.

Answer, This Syllogism lies liable to many Attacks: But I shall content my self to distinguish upon his Proposition. There is a twofold actual Justification, as has been already proved. The one, the Elect Sinner has in Christ, ever since Christ received an actual Justification for him in his Room and Stead, as his Surety and Representative. 2. There is an actual Justification brought down into the Conscience, and received by Faith. The former belongs to the Sinner; whilst in a natural State, nay before he has a being. The latter only, is the Sinner's by Faith. And 'tis to the latter, that those Blessings of Renovation, Sanctification and Communion are inseparably conjoynd. So that his Proposition is false, without the aforesaid Limitation: And understood with it, he does but beg the Question, and Disputes against that, which is not-denied him.

His Thirteenth Argument is against Union afore Faith. And it runs thus. *Union afore Faith supposes there may be Union between two Parties; when but one Consents; which he says is an Absurdity.*

I Answer, this again is begging the Question. For we do not affirm that, that Union, which is founded on Consent of Parties, (as the Marriage-Union consummated between Christ and the Soul) is afore Faith, but grant 'tis formed up by Faith. But will he deny all manner of Union to be afore Faith? No, he grants Union (which is Union on Christ's part, and that real too; to be afore the Consent of the Soul, and therefore he himself has answered his own Argument. I do also hope, he will grant this, that all Mankind were united to *Adam*; when he was yet alone, as their Root and Representative; before ever any of them had a being to ask their Consents; and that this Union was so really; that they are really affected with what befel him, and that by Virtue of Union. They sinned in his Sin, were condemned in his Condemnation; and in Sense executed in his Execution, Rom. 5. 12. to the end. And who dare say, they were not really one with him? After the same manner, the Elect number were united to Christ, when he took their Nature upon him, as a Surety, Head, Root, and Representative. And the Union between him and them, was so real; that they again were really Arraigned, Condemned, Sentenced, and in a Sence Executed in him; when that Threat of the Law was verified on them individually, as considered in their Surety; *The Soul, that Sins shall dye*: So again, they were really made to rise together in him, Eph. 2. 6. And Discharged in his Discharge, Rom. 4. 25. compared with 8. 34, &c. This Union Mr. *Rutherford* calls a Natural, Legal, and Federal Union; and 'tis this we affirm to be afore Faith, and requires not the

consent of the Parties in Union to make it up. And I am apt to think, the *Prefacer* will not
first *Adam*
and yet actual
Root, and
has a Right
tion at all,
oming Con-
Conscience,
Bar above,
in *Black*, but
ut Comely
2 Cor. 12.
sense of it,
al weakness
above can
g all things,
it has no-
things by
and above
ne peculiar
Ministers of
Jurisdiction
fore I shall
Consequents,
ne actually
guish upon
e one, the
Room and
into the
ural State,
atter, that
so that his
g the Que-
Faith sup-
rdity.
which is
the Soul)
to be afore
to be afore
also hope,
their Root
this Uni-
of Union,
his Ege-
After the
him, as a
real; that
in; when
The Soul,
And Dis-
rd calls a
es not the
Con-

His Fourteenth Arguments, That *this* Notion with that of Justification tends to put Men upon fighting the Holy Law of God; and renders the Doctrine of Repentance needless, or a meer legal Doctrine.

Answer. I am amazed at such Logick. 'Tis enough for me to say here. I deny his Consequence and desire him to prove it. For my Part, I cannot see how this argues a shadow of Consequence with it, as some of the rest do. But he might as well have inferred thus. If this Doctrine of Justification and Union afore Faith be true, it puts Men on a strong Temptation to go on Foot, when they should Ride; and such Fopperies, that are not to be named; least we provoke to Laughter in serious Matters. Of all his Consequences, this to me appears wildest and wildest. Nor can I tell, wherefore this Inference should be brought: Unless it were to make way for to expose *David Culy*, the Church of *Rowel* and my self. If he infers from *David's*, *Culy's* slips: As formerly the hot Zealots of *New England* from the Falls and strange Opinions of some amongst them; that Union or justification afore Faith, is the *Trojan Horse* that had them all in his Belly. I would have him seriously consider, that his way of arguing is like the *Papists* of Old, arguing against the Reformation. Because amongst the Reformers that left them, there were *Socinians*, that denied the Godhead of Christ; and some, that denied the Law to be a Rule of Holy Walk; and *Anti-pedo-baptists*, that held strange Principles, and had stranger Practices; that therefore the Doctrine of Free Justification, and that concerning their Mass and Images being Idolatry, were Licentious, and Erronious Doctrines. And does he think in his Conscience they did do well? There is no end of accusing Principles, from the falls and mistakes of some, that profess it. All Parties have done it, and it has still returned upon themselves? But to what he has done of that kind, I have answered already.

His Last is, That *this* tends to lead People to venture on Christ presumptuously; and conclude, they are justified, though they continue wicked, &c. This is the very same with his fifth Absurdity. And therefore the same Answer shall suffice. And the Reader must pardon me, if I have gone over again and again the same Answer's as to Substance; for he necessitated me thereunto, when he had cast but the same Topic into divers Shapes and Phrases.

From his Arguments, I pass to his Authorities. And the first he brings is the Determination of the Messengers and Pastors of 106 Churches in this Point of Doctrine; where they give it against Justification afore Faith. Whereupon I Remark.

1. That though I have a great Deference for the Judgment of so many Churches; yet Humane Authority has not footing firm enough for my Faith.

2. It was not the Churches, but their Messengers of their own Head determined the Point. And they indeed carried the Question to their respective Churches, and thereupon a solemn Debate after Prayer, each particular Church had come to such a Resolution, it then might have passed for the Judgment of the Churches. But I understand no such warranty from Christ Churches, have to depute their Messengers to determine Matters of Faith for them; nor what rule they have to depute their sense and judgments to them; nor by what Authority they set up the understanding of Twenty-four Good Men or more, to be the Representative Understanding of 106 Churches. So that to me, the Determination of those Servants of Christ, met at their Assembly at *London*, is no more than their own Particular Judgments: And no further to be received, than it has God's Word for it's warranty. And no more is the Judgment of any Man, or number of Men in the World.

What he quotes out of other Learned and Godly Men, makes nothing to his Purpose; for in the Places quoted, they speak not a Word against Union or Justification afore Faith: But that there is Union and Justification by Faith; which we also grant.

His Question proposed, and by him answered. I grant true, as to the main; but Clinches not as to the present Controversie, for still it runs on a mistake of the Question. And seems to be brought in to expose *David Culy*. So I pass it over.

Lastly, He desires us to consider, what profitable use can be made of Justification afore Faith.

In Answer thereunto, I do desire him to consider; What profitable use may be made of the Doctrine of Eternal Love, of Predestination and Election; of a compleat Satisfaction given in for us by our Surety; and of his taking out a Discharge in our Name and Stead? The same can we make of justification afore Faith: We cannot press People to believe on an Object that is not already provided. And I must say, if the Sentence of Justification was not conceived in God's Mind from Eternity, and pronounced upon us in our Surety at his Resurrection, afore it is terminated in the Conscience and

and received by Faith; *Our Preaching is vain.* The Faith of God's Children are also vain: They are yet in their Sins, 1 Cor. 15. 14. 20.

I take Notice of one thing more, and conclude. He says, Page 10. Why then does this Man make this *Sir and Division in Churches*?

I Answer, I have challenged the Libellers, and all my Reproachers to make good this Charge long ago in Print. But it has not been made good to this Day. Since he has again charged me published in Print; I do require this *Preface* to make good the same Charge, in respect of any Church I have made Divisions in; Nay, whether I have had the least Hand in their Differences at *Kilby*. I will appeal to them; whether I did in the least insinuate to them, or any of them Jealous or disrespectful Thoughts of Mr. *Coleman*; though I confess I was troubled to hear him once deny very warmly, God's predeterminative Concurrence, immediate to all Creatural Actions; explaining himself by this Similitude, that God set up Man like a Clock, to move and act by a general and indifferent Concurrence, if so much; being also informed, that he ridiculed in a certain Place, God's immediate Concurrence to a natural Action, to which Sin does cleave; by the instance of a Drunkard lifting up the Pot to his Mouth several Times; when he was at the same time, directed to consider that answer in the Assembly's Catechism about God's Providence. All which to me seems to be *Durandism* or *Pelagianism*; And I was made to fear sometimes, he could not be sound in supernatural, that was so corrupt in the Fundamentals of natural Religion; whose Principles seem greatly to diminish the Dependence of the Creature upon it's great Creator: Yet imputing this to his Ignorance in Scholastick Terms and Controversies, I kept this in my Breast, till of late, and aggravated it not to the Witnesses then Present; so far was I from working up their Minds to a dislike of him. Again, I put it to Mr. *Coleman* or any of them, that are gone off with him to instance, that I urged amongst them the Tenets now in Controversie; but only Preached Christ and him Crucified to them; and if for tis, I am hated, and reproached, I do herein greatly Rejoice. Again, I say, I do expect the *Preface* to make good his Charge, or else he cannot clear himself of being a false Accuser of a Brother, and a Poor Servant of the Lord Jesus. If he and others, continue falsely to accuse without making Proof thereof. I shall receive these Wounds in the House of Friends, as the subtil sort of Persecution for Christ's sake and his Gospel; and shall, I hope be helped therein to Rejoice, and be exceeding Glad, yet with Pity towards and Prayer for their Persons: And this with other things will be matter of Joy to me; that this smiting of Fellow Servants is an undoubted Sign my Lord is near at Hand. Amen. Even so. Come quickly dear Lord Jesus.

FINIS.

These Books following are Sold by William Marshall at the Bible in Newgate-street. And by John Marshall at the Bible in Grace-Church-street.

1. True Spring of Gospel Sight and Sense of Sin; by Mr. Davis. Price 6 d.
2. A Sermon Preached at the Funeral of Mr. John Bigg's; to which is added another Sermon upon the same Subject: Also a Narrative of Mr. Bigg's Conversion, &c. by Mr. Davis. Price 6 d.
3. Hymns Composed upon several Subjects; The Second Edition, by Mr. Davis. Price 1 s.
4. Justification without Conditions, or the free Justification of a Sinner: by Mr. Eyre. Price 2 s.
5. Christ made Sin, with Dr. *Cripps* Discovery of Christ being the first Gift to a Believer, before the acting of Grace in him. Price bound 2 s.
6. A Compendium of the Covenant of Grace, being Comfort to a dejected Soul; by Mr. Cross. Price 6 d.
7. A Plea for the Ancient Gospel: by Dr. *Chauncy*.
8. The Works of Mr. *Buynan*, containing Twenty Pieces in large Folio. Price 15 s.
9. Mr. *Buynan* of Election and Reprobation, unfolded and explained. Price 6 d.
10. Mr. *Beverlyes* Catechize of the Kingdom of Christ. Price 6 d.

Where you may be supplied as above, with Dr. *Owen's* Works, Mr. *Caryl's*, Mr. *Beverlyes*, Mr. *Buynan's* small Pieces: With all sorts of Bibles, Testaments, and Stationary Wares, &c.